

July 27, 1965

17655

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMATEUR ATHLETIC UNION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N.Y., July 20, 1965.

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I regret that my busy travels for the development of physical fitness and amateur athletics has prevented me from providing you with the materials requested in your letter of July 15. I did return to New York on July 6, but was off again before I got down to your letter. I have just gotten back again today and am compiling some material for you.

Your statement before the Senate on June 25, 1965, indicates an understanding of the importance of international sports and the values of amateur athletics for the youth of our Nation. As a service organization of volunteer workers for amateur athletics, we appreciate your interest and understanding.

We believe we are discharging our responsibilities in accordance with established national and international rules. It is also our firm conviction that the discharge of those responsibilities is done in a reasonable manner that is in the best interests of the deserving amateur athletes and amateur athletic organizations of this Nation. Our rules permit all amateur athletic organizations, including the NCAA, to have an opportunity for equitable representation on all committees. Also under our rules, NCAA athletes, along with athletes from every other amateur athletic organization in the United States, have a fair opportunity to earn positions on international teams.

I have enclosed some reprints of articles written to explain the amateur sports structure. Also enclosed is a cross-section of articles from the Nation's press which our president compiled for the AAU Board of Governors. I have tried to pick out the key facts and marked them in red for your easy perusal.

Also enclosed is a brochure "You and the AAU" and "The Story of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States." I hope these will be of assistance to you.

Please let me know if you desire more prints of any of the above, or if I can be of further help to you in your efforts to determine the facts behind this dispute.

Sincerely,

DONALD F. HULL,
Executive Director.

THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,
Kansas City, Mo., July 21, 1965.

Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: As I wired you yesterday, it was necessary for me, upon my return to the office July 7, to embark upon another extended trip. This accounts for the delay in my responding to your June 25 letter and I apologize for this.

First, let me state on behalf of this association that we welcome and appreciate your interest in this problem and look forward to an opportunity to present our position and the reasons therefor to the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate.

The NCAA, along with the national organizations representing the high schools, junior colleges, and other agencies interested in track and field, formed the U.S. Track and Field Federation (USTFF) for a worthwhile purpose. The administration of track in this country needed reorganization. Those who are the major contributors to the sport and represent more than 90 percent of the track and field resources in this Nation feel they

deserve a voice and vote equal to their contribution. There also is a place for the AAU in the federation, but as a partner and not a dictator.

The AAU was given the obligation, by the Department of State, to select the track team to compete against Russia. Should not the AAU, then, abide by the rules of those organizations from which it expects to draw the athletes? In short, if the AAU meet at San Diego was to be the final tryout, and the AAU wanted college athletes to compete, why should it not follow established rules of the colleges and obtain the necessary certification and sanction? The fact that college athletes did not show up in San Diego in any appreciable number, in my judgment, represents an AAU lockout rather than an NCAA boycott. Let me emphasize, it is not a question of the NCAA refusing to grant certification—the point is that the AAU won't seek it or accept it.

The issues which divide the U.S. Track and Field Federation (including the NCAA) and the AAU are real and meaningful and do not reflect petty bickering. There are many basic struggles going on in our world today which are quite worthwhile; in fact, the causes are absolutely necessary even though the reasons for engaging in such struggles get lost in the sometimes tragic, often misunderstood, and many times frustrating products of conflict. Such is the case in the school-college dispute with the AAU.

There are basic educational principles as well as sound athletic standards involved in this disagreement with the AAU. The school-college system of athletics forms the foundation stone for American athletic prowess in most of our sports. We believe we have an important and meaningful story to tell—meaningful not only to athletics in general but to the United States as a whole. We have long sought an impartial hearing board and that is why we have readily embraced the invitation of the Commerce Committee to appear at its hearing. I might observe that President Barnes of this association—prior to the AAU meet in San Diego—proposed binding arbitration to the AAU. The AAU declined to participate.

I look forward to the opportunity of meeting you at the time of the Commerce Committee hearings and, meanwhile, I am taking the liberty of enclosing publications which I hope you will find to be interesting.

Cordially yours,

WALTER BYERS,
Executive Director.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, both parties have thus shown themselves to be cooperative and apparently eager to reach a settlement. It may well be that the Commerce Committee hearings will result in a voluntary settlement.

But if the parties cannot or will not resolve this dispute themselves, then the Federal Government may be forced to step in once again. It is my hope that the NCAA and the AAU will be able to establish an arbitration board of some kind, on their own initiative. But if they do not, Congress may very well decide to do it for them.

I reiterate, Mr. President, that the parties to the dispute appear to be ready and willing to resolve it. I certainly hope that this will be the outcome of our hearings. We can ill afford to permit the continuation of a pitched battle between our leading athletic organizations, one which adversely affects the quality of our international competitors and punishes those innocent young athletes who happen to be caught in the middle. This situation will not be allowed to continue.

DEATH OF ERNEST S. BROWN,
FORMER U.S. SENATOR FROM
NEVADA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I know my Senate colleagues share the sadness of Nevada's Senators on the sad passing last Friday of Ernest S. Brown who represented Nevada in the Senate for a brief period in 1954.

Many Senators remember Senator Brown, although he retired from public life after serving 2 months in the Senate during October and November of 1954.

Senator Brown was a valued friend whom I held in the very highest regard. He was a man of deep conviction, a true leader, and a mainstay of the Republican Party in Nevada.

Although I often disagreed with Senator Brown's political views, I always held him in the highest esteem, as did the many Members of the Senate who served with him.

He was virtually a life-long resident of Nevada, having moved there when he was 3 years old. He graduated from the University of Nevada in 1926 and later entered the practice of law in Nevada.

His life was one of achievement. He served in the Nevada Legislature, as district attorney of Washoe County, and as an officer in the U.S. Army during World War II.

Senator Brown's many contributions speak highly of him and he will be sorely missed by those of us who had the privilege of knowing him. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Frederic M. Carlson
RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM ADOPTED
BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE
OF THE MENNONITE CHURCH

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the General Conference of the Mennonite Church at its 37th triennial sessions, July 10 to 16, 1965, adopted a resolution, in which they expressed their views regarding the military situation and our involvement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

We, the delegates to the 37th triennial sessions of the General Conference Mennonite Church are deeply grieved over the course of action being pursued in Vietnam. We note the statements made by other church and religious bodies such as the Mennonite Central Committee in its letter of June 2, 1965, to the President of the United States, the Church of the Brethren in their resolution adopted by the 1965 annual conference, June 22-27, and the Fellowship of Reconciliation in its April 14, 1965, advertisement in the New York Times. We are in general agreement with their call for reappraisal of the U.S. Government policy in Vietnam. "We believe that war is altogether contrary to the teaching and spirit of Christ and the Gospel; that, therefore, war is sin."¹

¹ From "A Christian Declaration on Peace, War and Military Service" adopted by General Conference Mennonite Church at Portland, Oreg., August 22, 1953.

July 27, 1965

We recognize that many countries, including the United States, share responsibility for the war in Vietnam, and we abhor the subversion and aggression of the Communists in Vietnam. In the first place we call on the U.S. Government and the other governments involved immediately to halt and disavow the bombing of noncombatants, the torture of prisoners and other such acts of war which are particularly abhorrent even to many in the general public and which seriously damage relationships to the peoples of Asia.

Furthermore, as a conference, we appreciate the efforts of the U.S. Government to negotiate a settlement and urge that it continue to explore every possible means to end the war. Acknowledging the complex nature of the problem and the ambiguities involved we would propose consideration of the following steps:

1. Use the United Nations and agencies of government neutral to the conflict in negotiating and controlling a settlement of the war.
2. Use the reduction of military acts and increased economic aid to demonstrate our good faith and sincere desire to end the conflict. We believe that intensified and increased economic development in the Mekong Delta would contribute to the resolution of the total southeast Asian problem.
3. Initiate negotiations for a united Vietnam arrived at by an internationally supervised system of self-determination, without insisting strictly on our preference of a political, social, and economic order.

We have committed ourselves as a church to expand our aid to Vietnam through the agencies of the national churches there. We are urging the congregations of the General Conference Mennonite Church—

1. To study the situation in Vietnam and discuss the issues involved in their congregations;
2. To communicate our spiritual and moral concern for Vietnam to the public and to stimulate others to study and express their concern over Vietnam;
3. To support faithfully by prayer and through gifts the expanding work of the Mennonite Central Committee in Vietnam;
4. To continue in prayer that the Government leaders involved will be given wisdom and understanding to fulfill their responsibilities and that peace will come to Vietnam; and
5. To pray for the welfare and safety of all Christian workers in Vietnam, including our own, and especially for Daniel Gerber, Dr. Eleanor A. Vietti, and Archie Mitchell, who are being held captive by the Vietcong.

Frederic B. Bayh
A FLAG FOR HUE, SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from two American servicemen who are among the many Americans currently defending freedom from Communist aggression in Vietnam.

This brief letter from two of my constituents reinforced my firm belief that our cause in Vietnam is right and just and, more than that, the attitude of Americans involved in that conflict is healthy and constructive.

The letter is from Pfc. David L. Dethlfsen, of New Castle, Ind., and Pfc. Roger W. Baser, of North Webster, Ind. I believe, Mr. President, you will agree that this note clearly indicates the respect in which Americans hold their South Vietnamese neighbors and the desire to help these people reach the goal of liberty and self-determination, free from the wanton aggression of the North.

Mr. SENATOR: We are writing to you in request for an American flag which can be presented to the city of Hue, South Vietnam, for the strides they have made toward democracy and the stand they have taken against communism.

We wish to show the people of Hue that the American people as a whole, whether they fight on Vietnamese soil or live peacefully on American soil, admire and honor a city with strength, courage, and the desire for a better way of life.

It is particularly hard for these people of Hue, inasmuch as the city is fairly well separated from its center of government, Saigon, and because Hue is very close to the North Vietnam border.

Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that a flag flown over the Capitol of the United States will be shipped as soon as possible to the city of Hue, South Vietnam. I am equally pleased that two young Hoosiers were the individuals who thought of this way of honoring their friends with whom they are fighting side by side in defense of freedom.

SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. This year also commemorates the 25th year of the heroic struggle for freedom by the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples.

This anniversary acquires a special meaning against the background of the recent events in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic as well as in view of the almost total elimination of Western colonial rule in the world, to which the continued Soviet colonial entrenchment in the Baltic States stands in sharp contrast.

I ask unanimous consent that the manifesto, issued by the Baltic States Freedom Council, which sums up the case for Baltic freedom, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the manifesto was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANIFESTO BY THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES, BY FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty-five years ago, in connivance with Hitler's Germany, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the assistance of the occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic States. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. The beginnings of today's international tension and threat to peace may thus be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, papuerization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror,

murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing and continuing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations Declaration, the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signature of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, have consistently placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States on October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States, the continued recognition of free Baltic diplomatic representatives by the United States as well as many European and South American governments; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

At the same time the hopes of the Baltic peoples have been strengthened by the global process of decolonization and the universal acceptance of the right of self-determination of nations. The liberation movement of the colonial peoples in Africa and Asia has helped to expose Soviet colonialism as well and has raised the hopes of captive Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians. They are convinced that the tide of emancipation from colonial rule will not stop at the borders of the Baltic countries.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet enslavers will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the 25th anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be coerced to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and to history. At this 25th anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the will and the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police, and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, use all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right to self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of East-Central Europe;

We further request that the United Nations' Decolonization Committee immediately fulfill its overdue duty and take up the case of Soviet colonialism in the Baltic States;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic people and to support the efforts toward the restoration of liberty to these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We share with our captive compatriots their view that the recent Soviet economic, political and ideological setbacks—inherent

logic, countries must choose logical development. Since we have resolved Mexican social problems in theory with the 1917 Constitution, since our generation has harvested the first healthful fruits issuing from its application, and since the principles are consecrated in practice by their efficacy, our mission now is to defend and protect our institutions with the energy and determination of those who defend and protect what is their own, vital, the very essence of nationality.

The various groups of diverse opinion in Mexico accept the general framework and cooperate with our specific constitutional institutions. What is legitimate and open to discussion is the question of how much out of national income is to be devoted to reinvestment and new investment, and how much must be destined to works of social benefit.

A nation with a mixed economy, Mexico must have capitalization to progress and, at the same time, carry out works of social benefit according to the Constitution, which result in consolidating economic progress by enhancing the domestic market.

We live under a system of law and consecrated individual liberties. This social progress under no circumstances is to be lost. A regime under law with effective liberties for only a select group and mere formalities for the majority, nowadays is doomed. It is of the utmost urgency to recognize individual liberty with an economic content, based on equality and combating all aspects of misery.

We have already witnessed how internally our people must rapidly establish the indispensable mechanisms for redistribution of national income, having as their goal the raising of living standards of the population. By so doing, besides complying with present-day social demands, a vigorous domestic market will be achieved, as the foundation of a healthful industrial integration. As to the international scope, developing countries such as Mexico have been demanding an indispensable revision of world trade, in order to avoid interchange phenomena harmful to their economies, and thus allow rapid economic development as the basis of their social progress.

Commercial development in our hemisphere, not to speak of other countries belonging to other economic areas, requires constant revision of our commercial relationship.

It already is rather old fashioned to make remarks about the dangerous fundamental deterioration of interchange. We must avoid, consequently, the drop in prices of raw materials, constantly downgrade, while having a tendency to higher prices for capital goods. This handicap impoverishes our peoples and is one of the most important obstacles to their sociopolitical development.

Irrespective of having considered a series of instrumentalities to guarantee remunerative prices for raw materials, the request has been made, as for instance at the Geneva meeting, that developing countries in strategic geographical locations be allowed to furnish their tropical products to international markets. Under this project, subsidies ought to be withdrawn from this type of production in the United States, and instead acquire from our countries tropical raw materials. It has been frequently stated that, rather than loans, Latin America needs fair prices for its exports.

The enhancement of domestic markets in our countries is achieved by securing purchasing power for the majority of our population. The enhancement of foreign markets must be attained by using all possible means. For this purpose, the people of Latin America must sell ever larger quantities of intermediate and finished products, at more stable prices, in order to purchase with that foreign exchange capital goods for their more rapid development. This is bound to result in

opening U.S. markets with more largess, and not levying excessive tariff duties on merchandise and products from our area.

Another aspect is that of credits for Latin American economic development, which should be extended preferably for the purchase of machinery and equipment within our own countries, rather than to continue making them conditional to the purchase of those tools for progress in developed countries.

A revision of "convention" cargoes is also required, as they force higher rates on our countries that have no merchant fleet, and have just entered foreign markets. Rate discrimination, on occasion, makes it impossible for our products to compete with those of highly developed countries protecting their products with very low special cargo rates.

It is likewise harmful to our development to subject to import quotas the entry of our products into this huge United States market. Drops in international prices ruin our economies; and as soon as there is a tendency to higher prices, the establishment of import quotas limits our income. It has been recommended that preference in the United States market be given to hemispheric production, particularly now that the world has been divided in areas for the obvious purpose of favoring area production. The European Common Market has hurt Latin American exports, and its preference for consumption of African products has shrunk Latin American exports. To compensate this actual loss, it is advisable to give preference to hemispheric production in what the United States consumes.

May I reiterate that the creation of mechanisms for domestic redistribution to raise living standards of the majority of the people, and a revision of international trade with a view to legitimately protecting developing countries, are measures demanded by the urgency of our times, which permit no delay lest greater social upheavals, political instability, and economic stagnation are to take place.

At the present hour of universal anguish and of legitimate aspirations of impoverished peoples, it is important to radically and effectively combat oppression, ignorance, sickness, and all manifestations of the misery of the people. Those who attempt to forget these urgent pending duties, by attacking or pretending to attack doctrines that are incompatible with our democratic systems, are only provoking an indispensable social revolution among their own peoples. The peace all of us are striving for is not secured at the price of oppression.

We want democracy, and yet, we forget that democracy is based upon liberty and equality. As President Diaz Ordaz clearly stated: "Liberty and equality cannot exist side by side with poverty, if there is poverty, there is neither equality nor liberty" and, consequently, we may conclude that there is no democracy wherever there is poverty. The social problem of subjected peoples must be resolved within the framework of their own and fundamentally democratic ideas. Then, and only then, shall peace be secured.

THE REFUGEE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a nationally syndicated article by Mr. Leo Cherne, dealing with the refugee situation in South Vietnam, and the efforts of the International Rescue Committee to help alleviate the lot of the refugees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. Cherne, who is perhaps best known as executive director of the Research Institute of America, has for almost two decades now played a leading role in the work of the International Rescue Committee, a nonsectarian organization dedicated to the assistance of all those who escape from totalitarian persecution.

Mr. Cherne has always believed that in planning any refugee program there is no substitute for on-the-spot inspection by the responsible heads of an organization.

Thus, in helping to organize the IRC's Hungarian refugee relief program, he became one of the first Americans to enter Budapest after its liberation.

In his recent tour of Vietnam he helicoptered around much of the countryside. Among other things he visited Dong Xoai shortly after the terrible battle which took place there last month.

He describes the city as a smoldering ruin, with streets filled with broken, smashed bodies, many of them women and children.

Mr. Cherne makes a basic point which some of the critics of our Vietnam policy ignore. He points out that the Vietnamese people have given conclusive proof of their hatred of communism in the massive refugee flow from North to South Vietnam, and in the flow from Communist dominated areas to non-Communist dominated areas.

Mr. Cherne also points out that there are 100,000 war-orphaned children in Vietnam and that the International Rescue Committee has decided to make this situation a special project. The IRC is appealing to the American people for a fund of \$2.5 million to assist the Vietnamese orphans and to provide medicines for the Vietnamese people.

I believe that all of us in this Chamber are familiar with the truly heroic work carried out by the International Rescue Committee over the decades—first in assisting the victims of Nazi totalitarianism; then, in the postwar period, assisting the scores of thousands of refugees from the Communist dominated countries in Europe; then in assisting the Hungarian refugees after the brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution; and more recently, in assisting refugees from Cuba and the refugees from communism in Vietnam.

I am sure that all of you who are familiar with the work of this great organization will wish it every possible success in raising the funds which it has made its target for relief in Vietnam.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Des Moines Register, July 6, 1965]

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES IN VIETNAM (By Leo Cherne)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Vietnam has become a nation of refugees. Some 380,000 peasants and villagers have crowded into the coastal towns as a result of Vietcong harassment.

Wherever the Vietcong have struck or threaten to strike—and this covers much of the countryside right up to the edge of Saigon—the Vietnamese people are often uprooted, homeless, ill or wounded, hungry. They are in desperate need of the essentials of life—food, clothing, shelter, medical care.

July 27, 1965

VOTING WITH THEIR FEET

The refugee problem is nothing new for Vietnam. In the summer of 1954, shortly after the defeat of the French and the signing of the Geneva agreement which partitioned the country along the 17th parallel, a massive flow of refugees from the Communist North had already begun.

The International Rescue Committee (IRC) set up an emergency program to aid these people who are voting for freedom in the only way they could, with their feet. Eventually almost 900,000 Vietnamese cast their lot with freedom by making the trip from the North.

The direction of the refugee flow clearly contradicts the claim that the Vietnamese do not understand the nature of the struggle against communism or are indifferent to the rule by the Communist North. Only about 10,000 Vietnamese crossed the 17th parallel heading north and many of those were Vietcong cadre returning home for more training.

THEY MUST FLEE AGAIN

Many who escaped south 10 years ago, now must flee again. They are the peasants and the villagers of Vietnam, the very people the Vietcong are supposed to have won to their side. My observations and conversations with Vietnamese and Americans here, have convinced me that the Vietcong have so savagely terrorized the peasantry that they have made them their mortal enemies.

I helicoptered from Saigon to Dong Xoai shortly after the siege which resulted in 33 American and 650 Vietnamese casualties. The Vietcong had burned out a large portion of the town. For a brief time they had occupied the village. They entered every household and stripped it of every scrap of food and every plaster which could be used to buy food.

When the Vietcong retreated they left Dong Xoai a smoldering ruin and streets filled with broken, smashed bodies (many of them women and children) some dead, others dying, still other condemned to live the rest of their lives horribly maimed.

U.S. RESCUE MISSION

The dust of battle had hardly settled when personnel from the U.S. operations mission (USOM) (our civilian aid program) and the U.S. Army Civil Affairs officers entered the town to take an inventory of needs.

It was arranged to fly in 5,000 kilos of rice. On behalf of the IRC I undertook to obtain 500 kilos of protein-rich fish and 50 pounds of salt, also to be flown in by U.S. Army helicopter.

These supplies, together with some powdered milk which the Vietcong somehow missed, kept the people of Dong Xoai from starving in a country in which starvation is rare.

Emergency medical treatment was begun immediately.

I have read much about our military involvement in Vietnam. But at Dong Xoai I could not help thinking that much of our work in Vietnam is not military in the strict sense, that much of our efforts are constructive, even life sustaining.

The children are a very special part of the tragedy of Vietnam. I have seen more horribly injured, broken, maimed children in a week in Vietnam than in my lifetime. There are perhaps 100,000 war-orphaned children in Vietnam.

EMERGENCY FUND DRIVE

We in the IRC have set an emergency fund goal of \$2.5 million—the highest in our 33-year history. The majority of these funds will go to aid the orphans. We also have undertaken a program to provide an initial \$500,000 in medicines to aid the Vietnamese. We hope to get a large measure of support from the American people.

The task of raising this kind of fund is herculean, but it is only a small part of what must be done to aid this nation of refugees.

If we fail to alleviate the pain and suffering of these people, not matter what the outcome of the war in Vietnam, we will have failed in our purpose as Americans and as human beings.

EASTERN AIRLINES PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH NONSTOP SERVICE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, we of Hawaii had good news yesterday when we heard of Eastern Airlines' announcement that it was proposing to link by direct nonstop service some of the great cities in the eastern half of the United States with our continually developing islands. We, of course, warmly welcome Eastern's proposals not only because they would link us more closely with the industrial centers of the United States, but for their endorsement of our own faith in the future of Hawaii and the Pacific and for the growth that we all know that direct air service would contribute to our State.

I would hope that the Civil Aeronautics Board will move promptly in their proceedings on this important matter. On a more personal basis, I would also hope that after the certification of these routes, it will be even easier for my friends in this Chamber to spend more time with us in the 50th State.

Mr. President, as many Senators will remember, it was only 6 short years ago that the dream of statehood for Hawaii was finally attained. And many of us still hear in our hearts the echoes of the words of those who argued against statehood for Hawaii. "Hawaii is not contiguous with the mainland," they said. And, in fact, when it took the most modern airplane then flying 20 hours, including necessary stopovers on the west coast, to carry passengers from New York or Washington to Hawaii, our opponents' arguments were more difficult to counter. Six years later Hawaii is a State and yesterday we were reminded it is less than 9 hours away.

Mr. President, we of Hawaii welcome these new route proposals and look forward to the early day when the promises therein will be realities.

AN INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was greatly encouraged by Secretary of the Treasury Fowler's recent speech which indicated the willingness of our Government to participate in a conference on our international monetary machinery. Secretary Fowler's speech marked a significant step forward toward a solution of the balance-of-payments problem which continues to plague not only the United States but other nations as well. Secretary Fowler's comments were made in the context of a marked improvement in our balance of payments—an improvement I might add due to the fine efforts of President Johnson, Douglas Dillon, and Robert Roosa. This new willingness on the part of the United States is not motivated by a new crisis in the strength of the dollar, but rather by a farsighted

determination to improve our international means of exchange in a calm atmosphere and not during a future payments crisis.

The Evening Star for July 19 contains a fine editorial praising President Johnson for his well timed call for an international conference. As this editorial correctly points out:

It has been clear for 2 years or more that reform of the free world's monetary system will be needed to prevent a liquidity crisis that could stifle the international economy. But, until now, conditions for negotiations have been wrong.

I am hopeful that an international conference can be speedily arranged. Now is the time to act when the nations of the world are aware of the problem, are seeking solutions, but are not driven by financial panic to protect their own interests at the expense of others. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOWARD MONETARY REFORM

A shrewd bargainer knows when to negotiate and when to wait. After resisting pressure to move faster, the Johnson administration finally has called for an International Monetary Conference. The call is well timed.

It has been clear for 2 years or more that reform of the free world's monetary system will be needed to prevent a liquidity crisis that could stifle the international economy. But, until now, conditions for negotiations have been wrong.

Chronic deficits in the U.S. balance of payments poured a steady stream of dollars into foreign countries. To a point, the dollars were welcome. But the flow at length became a glut, and in that atmosphere a shortage of exchange was the last thing Europeans felt inclined to worry about. There was widespread skepticism about the ability and will of the United States to stop the flow of dollars. Proposals to expand liquidity sounded like schemes to relieve the United States of the need to balance its accounts.

The picture has changed radically since the President launched an emergency campaign in mid-February to eliminate the payments deficit. Although the danger of backsliding has not vanished, the campaign actually yielded us a surplus in the April-June quarter. It already has started to tighten the supply of dollars abroad. The scarcity still is spotty and mild, but it gives the Europeans a foretaste of the real trouble they could encounter. They now have an equal stake with us in reform which would provide for an orderly growth of liquidity.

In the negotiations that lie ahead, expansion of credit mechanisms could help solve the liquidity problem. Beyond credit, it probably will be necessary to create additional reserves. One way would be to invent a "composite reserve unit," or "CRU." Major countries would deposit currencies in a pool and would receive CRU's representing their shares. The CRU's would be held in reserves and used in settling international accounts.

The detailed U.S. position on the shape of monetary reform has not jelled, but key principles are clear:

1. American negotiators will not consider devaluation of the dollar or a return to the gold standard.
2. The International Monetary Fund must provide the framework for a revised monetary system, and underdeveloped countries must participate.
3. The dollar must be maintained in its special status as a reserve currency.

Negotiations will be slow and difficult. But the growing strength of our dollar means at last that there is reason to hope for a successful outcome.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XVIII

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann, the internationally known columnist, in his syndicated column printed in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Asian War," is saying precisely what I have been saying for nearly a year and a half, starting with my full-length address to the Senate on March 10, 1964.

I can only wish that President Johnson would follow the course that is clearly implicit in this appraisal of our unfortunate, unnecessary, and unjustified military commitment in southeast Asia, with its steadily mounting toll of American lives and its foreseeable disastrous consequences.

I ask unanimous consent that Walter Lippmann's column appearing in today's Washington Post entitled "Asian War" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1965]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: ASIAN WAR

(By Walter Lippmann)

We are about to pit Americans against Asians on the continent of Asia. Except for the diminishing and disintegrating South Vietnamese Army, we have only token or verbal support from any Asian country. No great Asian power, Japan, India, or Pakistan, is allied with us. None of our European allies is contributing anything beyond scattered verbal support. We have no mandate from the United Nations as we had in Korea, none from NATO, none from the nations of this hemisphere.

The situation in which we find ourselves is unprecedented, and the best the administration has been able to achieve by way of approval and support from our own people is a reluctant and depressed acquiescence. For there has been no proof, not even a real attempt to prove, that the security of the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was, for example, when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain and the capture of the British fleet, or when Japan with a great navy threatened to command the whole Pacific Ocean including Hawaii and the coast of California.

Nations fight well when they are defending themselves, when, that is to say, they have a vital interest. It is the lack of an American vital interest which explains the current mood of depression and anxiety, which explains why our intervention in southeast Asia has for 10 years been so gingerly, so furtive, so inadequate.

There are in truth two main reasons why we are becoming ever more deeply involved in Vietnam. The first, must be the more powerful of the two, is a proud refusal to admit a mistake, to admit the failure of an attempt, begun 10 years ago, to make South Vietnam a pro-American and anti-Chinese state. More than anything else we are fighting to avoid admitting a failure—to put it bluntly, we are fighting to save face.

There is a second reason which weighs heavily with many conscientious people. It is a respectable reason. As stated by the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday:

"We're in Vietnam at the express invitation of the Vietnamese Government; we're fighting there for the Vietnamese people. But we're fighting also for the millions of people in the other threatened lands beyond,

people who haven't the power to defend themselves from the Chinese colossus, and whose lives, safety, and freedom depend on the strong arm of the policeman—which only we can provide."

My own view is that the conception of ourselves as the solitary policeman of mankind is a dangerous form of self-delusion. The United States is quite unable to police the world, and it is dangerous to profess and pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. How many more Dominican Republics can the United States police in this hemisphere? How many Vietnams can the United States defend in Asia?

The believers in America as the world policeman get around these practical difficulties by making an assumption—that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens elsewhere in Asia, that what happens in the Dominican Republic will determine what happens all over Latin America. This notion of the decisive test is a fallacy. The Korean war, in which we successfully defended South Korea, did not determine the outcome in Indochina. What we have done in the Dominican Republic will not protect any other Latin American country from the threat of revolution.

Revolutionary wars are indeed dangerous to order and it is baffling to know how to deal with them. But we may be sure that the phenomenon of revolutionary wars, which is latent in all of the underdeveloped regions of the world, cannot be dealt with by American military intervention whenever disorder threatens to overwhelm the constituted authority. On the contrary, it is more likely that in making Vietnam the test of our ability to protect Asia, we shall in fact provide revolutionary China with just the enemy it needs in order to focus popular hatred against us—a white, rich, capitalistic great power. We are allowing ourselves to be cast in the role of the enemy of the miserable and unhappy masses of the emerging nations.

DEATH OF ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at a time when our country was caught in a tide of complacency, Adlai Stevenson summoned the Democratic Party in 1962:

Let's talk sense to the American people * * * there are no gains without pains. * * * This is the eve of great decisions, not easy decisions * * * but a long, patient, costly struggle which alone can assure triumph over the great enemies of mankind.

Despite the odds, Adlai Ewing Stevenson never stopped talking sense. To a nation parading its nuclear might, he warned the dangers of atmospheric testing. To a people already wearied by the complexities of the cold war, he cautioned against the easy panacea.

Yet, two election defeats never daunted his courage, never dampened his devotion to his country. As our Ambassador to the United Nations which he helped construct 20 years earlier, he took upon his shoulders the criticisms directed at all Americans, and by so doing, blunted, and softened the accusations of our critics.

Adlai Stevenson represented the finest in our American heritage. In the forum of world politics, he was at once our spokesman and our ideal. We, and his story, will mourn his loss.

AMBASSADOR ARTHUR GOLDBERG

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday Arthur Goldberg was sworn in

as our Ambassador to the United Nations. Very few times in the history of this great land of ours has a man left the security, quiet, and prestige of the Supreme Court for a position as demanding and soul-trying. I join my many fellow Americans in praising the former Mr. Justice and now Ambassador, Arthur Goldberg for taking this courageous step.

All Americans can again feel at ease that our country is being represented before the nations of the world by a man who typifies the best attributes of our people. We all felt this was true while Adlai Stevenson was our representative at the U.N., and I know that I, as I am sure was true with the rest of my fellow Americans, felt greatly reassured when it was announced that then Mr. Justice Goldberg had agreed to assume this awesome burden.

Ambassador Goldberg has a brilliance of mind which made him a great private lawyer, a widely respected Secretary of Labor, and a greatly admired member of the Court. Long before he reached such high position, this brilliance was recognized. My old friend and teacher, the eminent professor of law, Leon Green, of the University of Texas, has often stated with pride that while he was dean of the Northwestern University Law School, his star pupil was Arthur Goldberg. My own acquaintance with the Ambassador runs back more than 10 years.

Ambassador Goldberg throughout his illustrious career has always been one of those who advance the frontiers of thought. As a jurist this has been typified by his concern for the innocent victims of crime. This is a field in which I have long been interested, and was greatly encouraged by Ambassador Goldberg's continued advocacy of a plan to provide compensation for the victims of crime. A man of his caliber, one who becomes increasingly concerned with the victims of crime while it is fashionable jurisprudence to concentrate solely on constitutional rights of the accused, is a man who is excellently qualified to represent our Government and our people before the nations of the world.

H.R. 7984, HOUSING ACT OF 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Congress in passing H.R. 7984, the Housing Act of 1965, has taken another step in solving this Nation's farm labor problems. Section 905 of this bill increases from \$10 to \$50 million the total appropriation authorized through 1969 for Federal assistance grants for the construction of low-rent housing for American farm labor.

As chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, I have carefully studied the problems of our Nation's agricultural workers and have found that one of the main reasons Americans are reluctant to work in our Nation's fields is the lack of adequate family housing.

The expiration of Public Law 78 has brought about a massive interstate recruitment program of American farmworkers. Adequate housing facilities for these American farmworkers who travel with their families is at the present time nonexistent. I realize that in

July 27, 1965

the past family type farm housing was not in great demand especially in those areas of our Nation which were heavy users of foreign farmworkers. Foreign farmworkers were either single males or traveled without their families. They were often housed in barrack type structures dormitory style. These structures were equipped with three decker bunks as sleeping accommodations and lacked family type sanitation and cooking facilities. For example, California, the Nation's largest user of foreign farm labor, in 1964 had 158,222 farm housing units for single males as opposed to 9,875 family housing units. Obviously, this type of accommodation is not suitable for a worker who is accompanied by his family.

The farmer who employs American farm labor has a unique labor problem in that he generally must provide housing for his employees. This housing is an extra item of labor costs; it has no economic value to the farmer beyond enabling him to attract employees and is only occupied for short periods of the year.

I realize that many farmers do not have adequate financial means to build family housing. The \$50 million authorized by H.R. 7984 for Federal grants in this area is an insignificant amount indeed when compared with the need for such housing.

A recent study by the State of California showed that there were 250,000 farmworkers in that State who earned less than \$2,700 a year. A great majority of these workers lived in dilapidated and deteriorated housing. In the heart of the California farm community an eight-county survey reported that 80 percent of the farmworker housing violated minimum standards of health, safety and sanitation. Sixty-five percent of such housing was deteriorated or dilapidated; 33 percent had inadequate sanitation facilities; 30 percent had no bathing facilities and 25 percent were without running water.

The lack of family housing is most acute in communities which have high seasonal, short-term labor demands. In California's Monterey, Santa Cruz, and Santa Clara Counties in the heart of that State's strawberry-producing area, there are only 183 family housing units.

The State of California estimates that in order to provide adequate housing for these farmworkers the cost would be \$4,000 per housing unit. These costs cannot be paid for by the farmworker since his low family income limits his opportunity of obtaining normal financing. The States with their already strained budgets cannot be expected to pay the entire amount.

Federal assistance such as is provided in H.R. 7984 is needed in order to better the lot of our Nation's agricultural workers. I realize, however, that low-rent housing cannot compensate for the effect of public policy which up until now has excluded American agricultural workers from such basic social legislation as minimum wage, collective bargaining and unemployment insurance. Federal grants for the construction of farm housing must only be a part of a

broader overall social economic program to better the lot of our agricultural workers.

OUR PACIFIC TRUST TERRITORY— TIME FOR REAPPRAISAL

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a timely and perceptive editorial on the political alternatives facing Pacific island peoples has been published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. I offer the editorial as another useful item to add to the information available for discussion among the growing number of those concerned with the present and future status of non-self-governing peoples of the Western Pacific.

As the Nation charged with administering the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands under a trusteeship agreement with the United Nations Security Council, the United States has an obligation to promote greater self-government among the 87,000 Micronesians who live in the former Japanese mandated islands. We are doing this with some success despite many difficulties.

Nearly 20 years have passed since we began administering the Pacific Trust Territory. It is time to take stock of our national policies and to seek a consensus on the eventual destiny for the peoples of the trust territory.

As the Star-Bulletin editorial cogently noted:

Of one thing we may be sure. Colonialism under the cloak of United Nations Trusteeship is not the final answer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin editorial of July 22, 1965, titled "Too Poor for Independence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
July 22, 1965]

TOO POOR FOR INDEPENDENCE

Pacific island leaders, meeting in New Guinea, almost without exception indicated that they do not want to be cut adrift from their more powerful protectors: the United States, France, Britain, New Zealand, Australia.

The one exception is Nauru, rich with phosphate, which is one of the few Pacific islands with resources enough to be economically independent. But even Nauru realizes that it would still have to depend upon Australia, which administers it under United Nations trust, for defense and some services.

None of the scattered island groups under U.S. trusteeship is economically viable in today's world at anything beyond the barest subsistence level. It is unlikely that the people of those islands, having known a higher standard of living than bare subsistence, will want to revert to the primitive economies they never knew.

A colonial status under the United States, or any other power, is an anachronism not sanctioned by today's enlightened political thought—or by the U.N. Charter. And yet these small island groups are too poor to be independent. Their leaders for the most part are well aware of this. While appreciative of the internal self-government that is coming their way, they fear the consequences of being cast adrift on their own.

It is against this background that the proposal to incorporate the Pacific Islands in the State of Hawaii emerges as one practical, if complex, way out. Senator Fong has

placed the idea before Congress and a study of the possibilities, if nothing else, may be forthcoming.

Of one thing we may be sure, colonialism under the cloak of United Nations trusteeship is not the final answer.

PUERTO RICO CELEBRATES 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF ITS COMMONWEALTH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Sunday, July 25, Puerto Ricans celebrated the 13th anniversary of the establishment of the island's Commonwealth. It was a day of rejoicing, made notable by addresses of the Governor, the Honorable Roberto Sanchez Vilella, of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, and others.

Because the establishment of the Commonwealth—an inaccurate translation really of the political status of Puerto Rico, a literal translation of its Spanish nomenclature being "associated free state"—has been so successful and has set such a fine example of what can be accomplished in eliminating colonialism in consonance with the wishes and needs of the people affected, I think it desirable that the two principal addresses—those of Governor Vilella and Secretary of the Interior Udall—be inserted in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOV. ROBERTO SANCHEZ VILELLA ON THE 13TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, JULY 25, 1965

Honorable representative of the President of the United States, distinguished guests of honor, honorable visitors, members of the three branches of government, friends, and fellow citizens, today we commemorate once again the greatest act of political creativity which our people have accomplished. Exactly 3 years ago, on a similar occasion, two historic letters were made public. Former Gov. Muñoz Marín wrote to the late President John F. Kennedy that our people should again be consulted on their political relations with the United States of America. The late President was in total agreement with this aspiration. On that same occasion, we were honored to have among us the man who is now President of the Nation. Lyndon B. Johnson said then that the exchange of letters constitutes: "a historic reaffirmation of our belief in the self-determination of peoples, when exercised with the acceptance of the responsibilities of freedom."

As a result of that exchange and that belief, a commission was created—composed of American citizens from Puerto Rico and from the continent, and with representation from all sectors of opinion—to study all the aspects of our relations with the United States of America. The commission is making this study because we are proud of our present relationship with the United States, and because we want to improve it. It is also making this study because we want finally to liberate the energies of our people from the narrow dilemma of political status. We will succeed.

I am confident that the work of the commission and the subsequent acts of our people and of Congress will result in the reaffirmation of our will, expressed time and again in the ballots: the will to associate with the United States on the basis of a compact of political equality. But regardless of the deliberations and studies made by the

to prove that we can offer hope where despair abounds, and to provide action where un-
concern and delay have for so long been the
prevailing theme. All too many of our cities,
and some of our more populous States, have
not displayed the drive and dedication to
help lift the people of urban America from
the chronic despair which too often sur-
rounds them. Look at our smog-filled cities,
our cramped and clogged streets, our poor
transportation, our unsafe sidewalks, our
rundown housing and schools. Look at the
lack of job opportunities, crowded court
dockets, and inadequate parks and recreation
facilities.

Look at the overcrowded schools and sub-
standard teaching; inadequate vocational
schools and outdated concepts of vocational
education; narcotic addiction of young and
old, increasing at alarming rates; a ghetto
life where a fifth of those who live in our
urban areas live under poverty conditions;
cramped, barely heated, unsanitary living
quarters; a middle class escaping to the sub-
urbs, while largely unskilled and semiskilled
fellow Americans flock to the central city to
seek something better than that from which
has been their lot; crowded hospitals and
surging costs of health care; ever-increasing
welfare rolls; public housing which is 10
years behind in meeting demand and which,
after 10 years tends once again to become a
slum.

Is this the America you want your children
and their generation to inherit? It is not.
These problems are not insoluble. We do not
have to tolerate them. An apathetic elec-
torate is the only reason why they are
tolerated.

With the splendid luxury of citizenship
which all Americans enjoy goes a con-
comitant duty which, too often, is not being
fulfilled by our people. When good people
stay home on election day through disin-
terest, be assured that those with a mission
and a political passion are being goose-
stepped to the polls in droves. Make no mis-
take. Those who accept the luxury of being
American but who decline to assume the
burden, create a vortex on election day and
every day, speedily filled by frantic and
frenetic political minorities intent on bend-
ing government to the far left or the far
right.

But the luxury of citizenship is not paid
for by casting a ballot at the polls. The price
of maintaining our free Republic requires
suitable exertions every day of the year and
in a variety of ways. The whole vast
panorama of issues and questions which
confront our American society, at every level
of government, and in every part of the
Union, cries out for attention, not by the few,
but by the many.

It is not enough to work for bond issues
for our schools to provide the bricks and the
mortar. We must work in our schools and
outside our schools to inculcate the values
of a free society and a sense of civic respon-
sibility. We must lend a hand and set a
better example, not of the "better off" to the
"poorer off," but on one human being to an-
other human being. Bricks and mortar are
not enough to assure education of the young
or the old. Let us remember that we must
be concerned with the quality of teaching
which goes on within each school or college.
Let us remember that the dedication of our
teachers alone will not pay for their food
bills, and that if you want to keep and en-
courage able and experienced teachers, or to
keep and encourage experienced welfare
workers, indeed, to keep and encourage all
members of society who are working with
the people in our cities, then we must be
willing to compensate them adequately for
their efforts.

It was the first Republican President,
Abraham Lincoln, who in a speech in Spring-
field, Ill., 6 years prior to his election in 1860,
provided this Nation and both political
parties with a criteria and a goal as appli-

cable today as then, and we seek to deter-
mine what public programs are appropriate
and inappropriate for the Federal Govern-
ment to undertake. Said Abraham Lincoln:
"The legitimate object of government is to
do for a community of people whatever they
need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so
well do for themselves, in their separate and
individual capacities. In all that the people
can individually do as well for themselves,
government ought not to interfere."

It was for succeeding generations to deter-
mine the community to be served, and the
level of government most appropriate to
meet those needs. It was for succeeding
generations to determine whether particular
needs of society might most appropriately be
met by the public or the private sectors of
our economy or by a combination of the two.
Thus have ensued the struggle, the challenge,
and the balance of federalism in America
and of a free economy regulated in the public
interest. You—the women power of Amer-
ica—can shape the outcome of this struggle,
this challenge, and this balance by the
action you have taken and will take in your
own communities.

Today America stands at one more thresh-
old. At home, it is the threshold of a new
era—an era of youth and urbanism, of
greater educational and skilled job oppor-
tunities, and of cultural and racial enlighten-
ment. Abroad, it is the threshold of bringing
into the world new and smaller nations in
freedom and in progress, of learning how to
feed and meet the needs of hungry people.
In every hemisphere, totalitarian commu-
nism continues its struggle to engulf man-
kind and to establish its imperialism over
every race and state.

Across the seas, deadly serious problems
confront our Nation in the jungles of South
Vietnam, in the weakened NATO Alliance,
and in the growing probability of proliferat-
ing nuclear nations. Millions of fellow hu-
man beings suffer from malnutrition. Dis-
ease and ignorance still stalk this globe. The
lust for power and domination is ever pres-
ent. From our own home communities to the
farthest corner of the globe, the eternal
conflict between good and evil continues.
There is a place in the struggle for every one
of you, women from business and from pro-
fessions, from the ranks of the governing
and from the governed; no, there is more
than simply a place, there is a duty station.

I believe that freedom has been best pre-
served and human well-being best advanced
in the American society by utilizing the
resources of our people to the fullest. If our
Nation and the free world are to survive, then
high morals, good ideas, and hard work are
the basic prescription. This country urgent-
ly needs your constant help. It needs your
active participation, simply as informed and
devoted citizens, doing their duty in Gov-
ernment and community affairs.

A great Governor of California, the late
Hiram Johnson, once said: "We are going
to forget for a moment how to make men
richer, and we are going to think how to
make men better." Hiram Johnson's re-
marks were not limited to men, but compre-
hended mankind. By your efforts you can
make the difference and determine whether
we do have a better America and a better
world.

Fe Nelson
A LAND WAR IN ASIA

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the
Appleton Post-Crescent is a forthright,
independent newspaper with a fine tradi-
tion of vigorous, intelligent commen-
tary on the State and National scene.

The Sunday, July 25, 1965, Post-Cres-
cent carried a particularly thoughtful
and important editorial entitled "A Land
War in Asia." The editorial seriously
questions "whether sending more and

more American troops to Vietnam is
really the answer to the Communist ag-
gression in that area."

I believe that other Members of Con-
gress will benefit from this thoughtful
editorial. I ask unanimous consent that
it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial
was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,
as follows:

[From the Appleton Post-Crescent, July
25, 1965]

A LAND WAR IN ASIA

Secretary McNamara's recommendation
that a great many more American troops—
perhaps 100,000 combat forces—will be
needed in Vietnam to halt the deterioration
is just what so many Americans have feared
and warned about. Now it appears that we
are committed to fighting a ground war in
Asia on terrain that works for the guerrilla
forces rather than our more advanced weap-
ons and techniques.

McNamara estimated the Vietcong forces at
about 165,000, many of them now supposedly
North Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese
forces are about 500,000 and there are some
75,000 Americans in Vietnam, about half of
which are combat troops. In antiguerrilla
campaigns, the ratio should be at least 5
to 1 and preferably as high as 15 to 1 since
the advantage of the hit-and-run jungle
attack is with the guerrillas.

But we seriously question whether send-
ing more and more American troops to Viet-
nam is really the answer to the Communist
aggression in that area.

The North Vietnamese Army has several
hundred thousand men under arms. In
China there are millions available for serv-
ice. Is there any reason to believe that both
forces will not eventually be thrown into the
fighting as far south as Saigon?

"The size of the Vietcong has increased,"
McNamara reported. "The rate of operations
has increased and the size of attacks have
expanded. The disruption of lines of com-
munications by rail, sea, and road has be-
come more intense. Terroristic attacks have
increased." And all of this since the last
shipment of American ground forces, the
marines and the 1st Division.

The American strategy presumably is
simply to make it so tough for the Vietcong
and the infiltrating North Vietnamese that
they will seek out negotiations. This is not
only reasonable; it is about all we can do
unless we withdraw. But what are the pos-
sibilities for the future?

Ho Chih Minh is supposed not to want to
ask for any more Red Chinese help than
arms and ammunition. If the Chinese send
troops, it is said that Ho fears they won't
ever go home and he is probably quite right.
But if the Vietcong and North Vietnamese
are on the verge of defeat in South Vietnam
and especially if there is the threat of South
Vietnamese invasion of the north—some-
thing now remote but which could happen
if the Vietcong are soundly beaten—it cer-
tainly is likely that Ho might turn to the
Red Chinese for aid. It is also quite possible
that the Chinese might not wait to be asked.
Are we going to continue to try to match
ground troops?

This is a war which we should not have
become involved in particularly in the way
we have. In retrospect it even appears that
our policy for Laos was wiser than the one
for Vietnam. At least the Laotians on their
own now have brought about a somewhat
stable government out of chaos while ex-
actly the opposite has happened in Saigon
despite or perhaps because of the presence of
American military "advisers."

It may well be, as infantrymen have al-
ways argued, that in the long run wars must
be won on the ground. Our bombings of
North Vietnam have not as yet brought

July 27, 1965

17668

them even to consider terms. We are handicapped by a moral restriction against bombing open cities—at least at this stage of the conflict. We don't dare bomb Russian missile bases as we prefer to try to tone down the Russian involvement rather than to force them further into opposition.

Some time ago Harrison Salisbury, military writer for the New York Times, warned that this would be a most serious and discouraging war and that we had to face up to the participation of a great many American ground troops but that we had no alternative except capitulation. Another Times writer insisted we must withdraw and recognize the future of Chinese domination of Asia. And yet would not exactly the opposite be true? We cannot turn backward but if we were not so militarily involved, it is more likely that there would be more homegrown opposition to the spread of Chinese influence among Asians, even in Hanoi, and more interest in vigorously opposing Communist aggression by such Asian countries as the Philippines, Japan, Thailand, and even Australia.

Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has reported strenuously and consistently opposed the commitment of massive numbers of American ground troops in Vietnam. This may be a major reason why he resigned as Ambassador and is being replaced by Henry Cabot Lodge. Whatever the chances of our present firm attitude persuading North Vietnam to come to the conference table, Americans must recognize the risks we are taking. Do we want to become involved in a major ground war in Asia with the obvious heavy casualties? Is the danger of Communist control of Vietnam that important?

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the August edition of Fortune magazine, there is an article entitled "Travel to Pacific Wars," written by Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy. The author has just returned from an extensive trip to the Far East and Vietnam. His sober presentation contributes to much needed perspective on the war in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Travel to Pacific Wars" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAVELER TO THE PACIFIC WARS (By Charles J. V. Murphy)

(NOTE.—Viewed in the perspective of U.S. strategy in the Pacific, the present war in Vietnam is only part, though a crucial part, of a much larger whole. The involvement of the United States and its allies stretches all the way from the Antipodes to Japan and Korea, and in fact four wars are presently going on in the Pacific area. The biggest, in South Vietnam, engages on our side some 580,000 South Vietnamese fighting men, at least 75,000 U.S. troops, very substantial fractions of U.S. tactical air and carrier task forces, and Australian, New Zealand, and Korean contingents. The other big war is the one launched by Indonesia against its neighbor Malaysia—the so-called confrontation war. This strange term was invented by President Sukarno for his, so far, unavailing effort to pitch the British out of Malaysia and most particularly off their commanding airfields and magnificent naval base at Singapore. This has drawn in some 50,000 British (including 14,000 Gurkhas), about 50,000 Malaysians (including internal security forces), and small Australian and New Zealand forces. A war collaterally related to the Vietnamese one is being fought in Laos

against the Hanoi-directed Pathet Lao. Here the hitherto desultory "neutralist" Laotian forces, with assistance from the Thais, are attempting to block the Ho Chi Minh trails into South Vietnam. The fourth war, between Taiwan and Red China, is in suspense except for occasional air and naval brushes.

(Until recently the anti-Communist powers in the Pacific have tried to maintain the fiction that their wars were separate. Now, in a very real sense, the wars are beginning to flow together. It is plain that the United States, its partners, and friends must rethink their Pacific strategy and alliances for the immense test in the making with Red China's power.)

(Fortune Editor Charles Murphy has been making an extended tour of the South Pacific. His report on New Zealand "Travel in a Small Utopia" and Australia "Travel on the Rim of Asia" appeared in the May and June issues. From Australia he flew on to Singapore and Bangkok. A report on that area will be detailed in an early issue. This letter begins with his reflections as he approaches Saigon and the larger war in Vietnam.)

There was not much to see from 30,000 feet. In these near equatorial latitudes, the rainy season had begun rather earlier than usual, and much of the time the plane was either in or over soggy, heavy cloud layers. Soon after takeoff from Bangkok, however, I noticed that the pilot angled southward over the Gulf of Siam, so as to skirt the Cambodian delta. Some few days before, the left-leaning, somewhat frivolous Prince Sihanouk had noisily broken off such diplomatic business as until then went on between Cambodia and the United States. His displeasure embraced Thailand as well, as America's good and helpful ally, and it was therefore only commonsense for the Thai commercial pilots to shy clear of the itchy-fingered gunners, friends and foes alike, who man the Cambodian-Vietnamese borders.

At this stage of my travels I was well up what I had come to think of as the Pacific ladder of trouble, which stretches from the Antipodes through Malaysia and Thailand into Taiwan and beyond to Panmunjom, across some 10,000 miles of land and ocean in all. In Borneo I had been shown what might in modesty be described as a VIP view of that other major Asian war—the so-called confrontation war between the new British-protected state of Malaysia and Indonesia. It's a bona fide war all right, although for cost and killing it doesn't begin to compare with the one that we Americans are in for in Vietnam, some 400 miles away, on the far shore of the South China Sea. Still, there were small but sharp running sea fights at night in Singapore Harbor while I was there, and shooting was going on in the rubber plantations of Johore and in the pepper groves of Sarawak and Sabah.

From Singapore, in due course, I had gone on to Bangkok. Alone among the SEATO partners and the American allies in the Pacific, Thailand occupies a physical bridge, or link, between the British war to save for the West the sea gate between the Pacific and Indian Oceans and the American war to save for the West a political and military lodgment on the Asian Continent. Though Bangkok itself is the capital of the SEATO alliance, Thailand is not yet formally a belligerent in the Far East. Nevertheless, it has become in a studied way a de facto power in both situations. It has bravely lent its geography to the Laotians and ourselves in manners it does not wish specified for military pressures against the North Vietnamese deployments that are a potential hazard to Thailand. It has also begun to give serious attention, for the first time, to the feasibility of a joint operation with the British and Malaysian forces for the purpose of cornering in the wild mountains of southern Thailand a band of Peiping-oriented guerrillas

who are the last surviving cadres of the Communist movement that sought to take over postwar Malaya.

Nations and people of like minds in the western and southern Pacific, it seemed to me, were finally beginning to come together out of a realization of a growing common danger. A year ago the United States, Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and Malaysia were pursuing their separate interests in the Pacific with sidelong glances at each other to see how the other was faring. Then, in a matter of months, the Australians and New Zealanders became engaged. Australians are now fighting in Malaysia; both Australia and New Zealand have taken the hard decision to send combat troops into South Vietnam. And so the alliances are converging.

There was no mystery about the circumstances that had finally begun to pull the Pacific alliances together. It was, first, the sudden appalling realization that the fragile structure of South Vietnam was on the verge of falling apart and, next, the spectacle of the United States striking with its too long withheld airpower at North Vietnam and moving tens of thousands of combat troops across the Pacific into South Vietnam. But it was not simply the agony of Vietnam, heartrending as that is, that finally galvanized the non-Communist powers into action. What happened was that tardily but unblinkingly the politicians in power in these Pacific nations finally recognized and faced up to a still distant but ultimate danger.

"THE TIME TO STOP MAO"

Most certainly the danger does not rest simply with a fear that if South Vietnam should go down, then that wily septuagenarian Ho Chi Minh will fasten communism on a primitive community that does not really want communism. The central danger is that if the Vietnamese social structure should finally dissolve, in the face of the now quite desperate American efforts to hold it together, then the Red Chinese will have stunningly proved the case for the so-called wars of national liberation, wars waged in the guise (to borrow the jargon of the original Soviet handbook) of antimperialist national-liberation movements.

It may come as a surprise to some, but the fact is that few understand this rising danger more acutely than do the politicians and intellectuals of the non-Communist socialist left. In Auckland and Wellington, in Canberra and Melbourne and Sydney, in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur, one man after another said as much to me. Their shared reasoning went something like this: "You Americans must never give up in Vietnam. Red China is the enemy. Now is the time to stop Mao. Only you Americans have the military power to do the job." Then, after a pause, this sotto voce apology: "Of course you will appreciate why we can't say this publicly. Politics, you know." All the politicians in the Pacific knew that even Prime Minister Shastri of India, while publicly deploring the American air bombing of North Vietnam, had privately spoken admiringly of the American resolution. And the diplomatic grapevine vibrated with the news that even Prince Sihanouk and the somewhat anti-American Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore were agreed in their private conversations in May at Phnompenh that American military power had entered the battle none too soon.

What the Pacific leaders are finally braced for, while still flinching from openly acknowledging its inevitability, is a decisive contest between the United States and Red China. There can be no real peace in their world of non-Communist Asians—a community of 1 billion people—until the power question has been settled one way or another. I pondered what this judgment involves for us: can the United States even hold on in Vietnam without pressing the war home di-

rectly against North Vietnam and the power center in Hanoi itself? Judgment on this was to be made soon enough on my arrival in Saigon. What I was sure of, already, was that a whole new experience, a test, a struggle, possibly even some fantastic ordeal, is unmistakably in the making for the United States in the Pacific, and a new and formidable chapter has opened in U.S. history. There is no mistaking the character and meaning of one fundamental happening. It is that the U.S. strategic center of gravity has moved west of the 180th meridian, into the Asian Pacific. It is almost certain to stay there for years to come.

The pity, the folly, is that the famous men who have been manipulating the American tactics and strategy in the struggle for South Vietnam let the rot and collapse there go on so long. Indeed, I was hardly back in Saigon before I began to wonder whether all of Lyndon Johnson's men have grasped the full seriousness of the new situation. After getting settled in the Caravelle Hotel in the center of the city, and sharing a meal with several colleagues in a tiny bistro run by an expatriate Frenchman with a perhaps exaggerated reputation for occasional murder, I took a walk in the direction of the Saigon River. My path led me past the American Embassy, which had been all but demolished in March by terrorists' bombs. With the reconstruction not yet finished, it put me in mind of the bridge structure of a battleship. The outer walls had been heavily reinforced; the once tall windows had been contracted to narrow turret-like slits; shatterproof plastic was being substituted for glass, to reduce the danger from lethal flying splinters in the event of another bombing; and the street approaches to the building itself had been closed off with upended sections of sewer pipe weighted with concrete to form a barricade.

These defensive dispositions I noted with approval. Then I was taken aback to hear my companion, an officer of fairly senior rank, say that on orders from Washington construction of a new Embassy, to cost about \$1 million, was to be started immediately in a residential area. The design had been chosen some years ago, during the false lull that followed the French defeat and withdrawal; it calls for a handsome three-story office building with spacious windows and wide entrances appropriate for a tranquil garden setting. The site was further attractive at the time of its acquisition because of its close proximity to the Premier's office. In the current mood of Saigon, however, this handiness no longer is an advantage. There have been 10 changes of government since November 1963—or were there only 9?—and the mobs have got into the habit of demonstrating in front of their Premier's windows every few months, usually in protest over his supposed subservience to the American Ambassador. To put up the new Embassy more or less on the direct line of the mobs' accustomed march struck me as a heedless action. Indeed, the whole scheme seemed most untimely; our diplomacy, my friend and I were agreed, might be most prudently conducted for the time being in the present bunker and the million dollars invested in ammunition.

OUR LONGEST LOSING WAR

If I appear cynical about the conduct of American business in South Vietnam, it is because in the course of my visit here I find it hard to be anything but distressed and shocked by the American management of what has become a large and costly war. With the end nowhere in sight, it is already the longest losing war that Americans have been engaged in since the French-Indian wars in the middle 18th century.

In President Eisenhower's last year, U.S. military aid to Vietnam came to only \$65 million, and our military mission there totaled 773 officers and men. Within a year our military aid to that country was more

than doubled, rising as it did in fiscal 1962 to about \$144 million, and the military mission was increased some twentyfold, the strength rising to nearly 17,000 men. As this article went to press, early in July, something like 75,000 U.S. troops were already deployed, in one role or another, in South Vietnam. This figure does not take into account some 27,000 fliers and sailors who man Carrier Task Force 77 of the 7th Fleet, and who are wholly in the fight. Nor does it include the general support being provided the forward forces by the large permanent Air Force and Navy establishments in the Philippines, Japan, and on Okinawa. Very substantial fractions of the Tactical Air Command and the Navy's fast carrier task forces have been concentrated in the Pacific and the westward, or Pacific, tilt of our military resources is generally much more pronounced than most Americans realize.

The capital input has also soared, although its true magnitude has been to some degree concealed. As the battle went against "McNamara's war" (as he himself described it), he was able to absorb the rising costs without a stiff boost in the defense budget by drawing upon the emergency-reserve stocks of the U.S. forces and by reducing or deferring their less urgent normal operations. As a former controller, the Secretary appreciates, of course, the eventual perils of such a practice for a defense strategy that stressed a high degree of readiness for both general war and simultaneous limited wars oceans apart. The running costs of the Vietnamese operation appear to have risen to about \$2.2 billion annually. These costs break down roughly as follows:

Continuing economic aid to keep the Saigon Government afloat and to pay the bureaucracy: about \$300 million annually.

Other economic support to the Vietnamese infrastructure: about \$70 million.

Military assistance programs (weapons, pay for the Vietnamese forces, overhead cost of the U.S. military advisory establishment): about \$330 million annually.

Indirect costs represented by other forms of U.S. participation—including the combat forces, day-to-day military operating costs—that are absorbed by the U.S. defense budget: an estimated \$800 million annually.

Extraordinary additional U.S. military costs, chiefly for port and airfield construction, and for replacing reserve stocks of ammunition, fuel, and so forth: \$700 million, to be financed by the supplementary appropriation that President Johnson asked for in May.

And we are in for an eventual bill for the war that will be much stiffer than the Pentagon cares to divulge just now.

THE MONSOON OFFENSIVE

Although McNamara has demonstrated his ability as an administrator of a vast bureaucracy, the primary job of the Pentagon is to conduct war—and the only war McNamara has so far been called upon to conduct has gone very badly from the outset. When President Johnson finally decided in February to put North Vietnam below the 20th parallel under the U.S. air counterattack, and to bring U.S. jets to bear for the first time in the battle for villages and roads inside South Vietnam, it was an act of desperation. The South Vietnamese Army was actually disintegrating. To the extent that a government remained in Saigon, it was the thinnest kind of film over the American presence.

The U.S. air counterattack achieved all that was expected of it, up to a point: it did check the Communist offensive. It had the effect of driving home barely in time a bolt to hold a door that was swinging wildly on its hinges. But by reason of the very limitations that the political direction of the war in Washington imposed upon the air counterattack, the blows have only impaired,

without paralyzing, the Vietcong's capacity for further heavy fighting. There is excellent reason to believe that the North Vietnamese buildup was well advanced before the February air attacks on the principal supply lines to the Vietcong forces in the battle zone. Enough trained troops were by then already deployed inside South Vietnam, and enough battle stocks had been laid by or were within its reach, for the enemy to decide that it could still continue to sustain a powerful offensive by its standards through the monsoon season—i.e., into our autumn. Certainly, it is acting as if it had such means.

The Communist guerrilla forces are the lightest kind of infantry. Once armed and equipped, they don't need much replenishment other than ammunition. They live off the country. U.S. Army intelligence measures the Communist military strength at present inside South Vietnam, in terms of organized forces, at more than 100 battalions. It further hypothesizes that this force, with a daily average aggregate consumption of from 100 to 150 tons of supplies, could fight from 20 to 30 sharp two-battalion-size actions every month. Ho's flitting battalions don't need much in their supply wagons, because they are not required to hold ground. The marines and the U.S. Army in their re-doubts and strongpoints are not the targets. The target is the exposed hamlet or district or provincial capital, or the column vulnerable to ambush.

So, the U.S. air counterattack notwithstanding, the critical phase of the 1965 monsoon offensive remains to be fought. No knowledgeable officer that I talked to in South Vietnam was sanguine about the outcome of the summer's fighting. It is not a question of our marines, or our airborne troops getting overpowered. Ho Chi Minh is too smart to send his light infantry forward to be mowed down by American firepower. The U.S. military problem at this late hour consists in finding some way to lift the pressure from the exhausted Vietnamese village and district garrisons. And if the struggle continues to go as badly against the South Vietnamese in the rest of the monsoon season as was the case in May and June, a force of from 200,000 to 300,000 American troops will be none too many simply to shore up a sagging Vietnam Army for the elementary tasks of holding Saigon, the major ports and airfields, the strategic provincial capitals, and the main highways.

AN OLD SOLDIER'S ADVICE

This is an outcome that was never meant to be. U.S. ground forces fighting Asians in Asia? Until the other day, the idea was all but unthinkable. At the White House, for example, whenever the question arose of how U.S. military power might best be used in Asia, President Johnson used to tell about his last talk with Gen. Douglas MacArthur at Walter Reed Hospital. "Son," the President quotes the dying soldier as saying to him, "don't ever get yourself bogged down in a land war in Asia."

MacArthur's view has been an article of faith with U.S. military men and notably of the Army Chiefs of Staff ever since the bloody island campaigns against the Japanese. It was a view shared by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor before he was sent to Saigon as special U.S. Ambassador. Once there, and with Vietnam falling apart around him, Taylor reversed his position. He was not happy about it. He was confronted with the testing of a military policy by which he himself, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and McNamara had reshaped the Armed Forces over a period of 3½ years: making a great point of preparing U.S. troops for limited and counterinsurgency wars. The truth is the Army's investment in these particular skills was nothing like what it was cracked up to be. Nevertheless, in the absence of decision in Washington to aim the U.S. air attack primarily at

July 27, 1965

North Vietnam, Taylor had no choice but to ask the President for combat troops to be directly committed in the South.

THE MORNING THE B-57 BLEW UP

As I looked around, I could not help feeling that the condition of our forces left much to be desired in the most elementary respects. One of the major military air bases in Vietnam is at a place called Bien Hoa, 18 miles northeast of Saigon. At the time of my visit there, in May, jet operations were possible only from three runways in the entire country, and Bien Hoa had one of them. The original airstrip was built by the French Air Force, on a rubber plantation that occupied the north bank of the Dongnai River.

One can drive to Bien Hoa from downtown Saigon in half an hour over a new three-lane asphalt highway. Light-engineering plants have sprung up on both sides of the roads, and racing along with the crowded buses and the careening trucks and the honking and hooting motorbikes, one has the sense of passing through a thriving, prospering, mushrooming suburb. This impression is valid enough, as regards the construction indexes. But the area is also a genuine no man's land. Open to traffic and commerce with Saigon by day, it reverts to Vietcong control at night. The notorious war zone D—a densely forested stronghold that the B-52's have been methodically bombing—begins just to the north of the airfield and, every few days or so, black-suited Vietcong in their outposts take potshots at planes on the final approach.

When I came this way a year ago, the Air Force contingent at Bien Hoa numbered only 400 men and they operated 40 light planes. When I returned this year, one blindingly hot Saturday morning, it was to find the Air Force unit swollen to about 2,300 men and they were operating 100 planes, including a number of light jet B-57 bombers. And that was not all. On the same field were jammed another 100 U.S. Army planes, mostly helicopters, plus another 100 planes belonging to the Vietnamese Air Force, mostly light, close-support, propeller-driven craft. This made a total of about 300 aircraft collected around a single strip. It was the dirtiest, most slovenly, ramshackle air operation I have ever visited. One can excuse a lot in war, but the confusion, disorder, and disarray here were beyond excuse.

For one thing, more than 6 months earlier, in the early morning hours of November 1, 1964, a handful of Vietcong mortar men who had penetrated the base's outer defense system laid down a fast and accurate barrage that destroyed, in a matter of minutes, five costly B-57 bombers on their hardstands. The chances of a return visit by the Vietcong were high and, indeed, shortly before my call, a brigade of the U.S. 173d Airborne Division was hastily taking up positions around the base to guard it from an expected attack in force. Yet even then, the costly planes, tens of millions of dollars' worth of them, stood wingtip to wingtip for want of dispersal room; and, incredibly, a dozen or so simple concrete and earth revetments to protect the planes had not been finished. Funds for new construction, I presently learned, were difficult to come by in Washington. So under the very eyes of the two-star Air Force theater commander, the four-star Army general in command of the entire war, and even the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs who sat in Saigon, the squalid, inefficient, and dangerous operation at Bien Hoa was tolerated and left to an overworked Air Force colonel to manage as best he could.

The poor chap didn't manage very well. Less than 24 hours later, from an angled distance of maybe 2,000 yards and a height of 4,000 feet, I was a chance eyewitness of Bien Hoa's second and far larger disaster. I was aboard a Navy plane, en route to Task Force 77 on station in the South China Sea. Our course took us past the base and, as it hap-

pened, while he was only 2 minutes or so away, our pilot saw a puff of smoke, then a swelling fireball, and he sent word aft that Bien Hoa seemed to be "blowing up." When the field came abeam, I saw that the entire block of B-57's was fiercely ablaze, and the conflagration had spread to long files of light piston-powered bombers, the A-1's. My first thought was that the Vietcong mortar specialists had done it again; then I realized that the recurring explosions were caused by bombs exploding in the racks of the burning planes. A careful inquiry by the Air Force failed to identify the root cause of the disaster. Most likely, a defective fuse or the faulty stowing of an old 750-pound bomb aboard one of the B-57's—the bombers there still were being armed with 1944 vintage "iron" bombs—started the chain reaction. Twenty-two planes blew up, more were damaged; a loss of that magnitude in an air battle would have been cause for national anxiety. The pennypinching that contributed to this episode and the timidity that impelled experienced officers to endure a scandalous situation did credit to no one.

REFLECTIONS IN A HELICOPTER

The American officer corps is, needless to say, a good deal more competent than this incident may suggest. In Vietnam, though, the Army is up against a slippery, slithering kind of battle that it can't seem to get a hard grip on. Doubts about the Army's preparedness for such campaigning were amply confirmed—despite all the high-flown theorizing about counterinsurgency tactics. A morning's helicopter tour of a crucial war zone in the company of an intelligent, youthful operations-planning officer, Brig. Gen. William E. DePuy, was highly informative in this respect.

A helicopter can't be beaten for enabling a general infantry to get around and to see what is going on beyond his headquarters. On this particular morning, General DePuy, at the cost of being only 5 hours away from his busy desk in Saigon as the senior U.S. military planner, made a swing in his clattering helicopter that took him into three provinces, afforded him a grandstand view of a helicopter attack in company strength, brought him into a quick conference with the staff of a Vietnamese division engaged in a "search and destroy" sweep on the edges of a Vietcong staging area, and finally put him down at the heavily barricaded headquarters of a great French-operated rubber plantation for a canvass of the tactical situation with the U.S. advisers to a Vietnamese battalion that was braced, behind its sandbags and slitted brick walls and barbed wire, for a night descent by the Vietcong.

Helicopter etiquette orders the seating of the noncombatant guest inside, between the escort officer and the port and starboard riflemen; their bodies are interposed between him and the open doors through which a sniper could sensibly aim. The guest must take his chances even Stephen, of course, with whatever ill-aimed shot might come up through the floor. DePuy sat alongside me, and as we flew west by north, he kept up a running commentary on places and events in the changing neighborhood in view. I was familiar with the region, having traveled over the same area the year before. But I marveled again at how close the swirl of battle remains to Saigon, and how vague and impalpable the enemy remains. From our altitude one could see 40 miles or so, and in this watery domain, north and west of Saigon, given over to rice paddies, rubber and tea growing, at least 1,000 sharp battles of one kind or another—ambushes, night rushes on sleeping hamlets, skirmishes—have been fought during the past 3 years. To the west, I had a fine view through broken clouds of Cambodia and the forested waterways over which the Vietcong come and go in sampans. We flew at 5,000 feet. But I never did see a Vietcong.

THE TROUBLESOME REDOUBT

The educational aspects of the flight included a skirting of the zone D area north of Bien Hoa. As described earlier, this is reputedly the major Vietcong base for their operations against Saigon itself. From the air, it put me in mind of the Louisiana river country, except that the forest here is much more dense, with the tree canopy reaching in places to heights of 200 feet. The forest redoubt covers about 150 square miles, and from the accounts of defectors and prisoners it is both a maze and trap made up of secret trails, hidden strongpoints, and supply dumps, and bunkers connected with deep tunnels impregnable to air bombing.

None of this can be seen from the air. I was shown a short, narrow gray swath in the forest left by the Air Force in its forlorn experiment some months ago to defoliate the region by saturating the tree tops with a mixture of napalm and chemicals. The chemicals were expected to dry out the trees and the napalm to set the forest ablaze. But, for various reasons, the hoped-for conflagration never got going, and the experiment was abandoned as being too costly and tricky. Now, the Air Force is trying to reduce the forest to matchwood with B-52's.

I doubt even the B-52's will make much of an impression with TNT, unless McNamara wants to make tree-felling a new career for SAC, or unless SAC has the extraordinary good luck to pinpoint and smash the headquarters area. But it was equally obvious that the job of prying the enemy out of the forest tangle was hopelessly beyond the competence and means of the troops we had committed. In recent major engagements the air attack has again and again finally turned the tide of the battle. But it must also be said that, for the Vietnamese garrisons, the turn has usually come too late. Since the Vietcong time their assaults at night, and in the monsoon season at intervals when they can count on cover from rain and clouds, the Air Force's ability to react quickly has been sorely limited on occasion, and in consequence battalion after battalion of Vietnamese regional troops were cut to ribbons before help came. One doesn't have to look very far to observe that, except for the introduction of the helicopter, there has been little new invention to prepare the ground forces for the kind of war they are now being asked to fight. Indeed, the United States doesn't even yet have a satisfactory airplane to support this kind of action. We are therefore obliged to use planes that are either obsolete (A-1's and B-57's) or too valuable (F-105's and F-4's).

THE CASE FOR GOING NORTH

It is time that the E-ring in the Pentagon stopped kidding the troops, and that the rest of us stopped kidding ourselves. It makes no sense to send American foot soldiers, rifles and grenades at the ready, into the rain forests and the rice paddies and the dim mountain trails to grapple with a foe whom they cannot distinguish by face or tongue from the same racial stock whom they seek to defend. On every count—disease, tropical heat and rain, the language curtain—the odds are much too high against their making much of an impression. When the question arose last year of sending U.S. combat forces into South Vietnam as stiffeners, serious consideration was given to the proposition of forming them into a line, a sort of cordon sanitaire, across the jungle and mountain approaches through Laos and Cambodia, with the object of thereby sealing off the Communist supply routes. This impractical scheme was discarded in view of the all but impossible cost of supplying the Army at anything like its desired standards, and the further consideration that nine-tenths of the force's energies and means would be consumed merely in looking after itself. The solution that was adopted and is being followed now is to settle the troops in garrison-

like strongpoints along the coast. It has been romantically suggested that these places will in due course become sally ports from which our troops will issue forth into the hinterland, spreading in ink-spot fashion stability and hope among the hamlets. But such a process could take a decade or two short of forever. It also means military occupation, the last thing Kennedy, McNamara, Taylor & Co. had in their minds when they resolved in 1961 to risk a stand in South Vietnam. Taylor understood this perfectly, and the dreary outlook no doubt made it easier for him to leave Saigon.

THE U.S. ADVANTAGE

Is there an alternative strategy? There certainly is. It is one, however, that revolves around a different set of premises than the McNamara-Taylor strategy has so far favored. Most particularly, it means shifting the main weight of the American counterattack from a ground war below the 17th parallel to an air offensive in North Vietnam itself, accompanied by a blockade of the North Vietnamese coast. Does this mean leveling Hanoi? No. It means, if necessary, the deliberate, progressive destruction of the North Vietnamese infrastructure—the plants, the railroads, and electric-power systems, the ports—to a point where Ho Chi Minh can no longer support his aggression in the South. Will this cause Ho to capitulate? Not necessarily. Ho is an elderly Asian revolutionary whose education in communism began in Europe after the Bolshevik revolution. More of his adult life has been spent outside Vietnam than inside. His government will probably be wherever he chooses to hang his hat.

But if his capacity for mischief is reduced, then our object is served. That object, it seems to me, is to lift from South Vietnam, at all possible speed, the terrible pressure on its hamlets. Because that task is manifestly beyond the competence of the Army and Marine Corps, except in a prolonged and costly test of endurance, then we must pick up our weapons of technological advantage—the air arms, both sea and ground based. What has made the American fighting man better than his enemies is higher technological proficiency. It seems folly for us to fight in Asia without drawing on this technological advantage. It might be highly desirable, for instance, to use our seapower and ground troops to a limited extent to establish a beachhead near Haiphong, thus threatening the enemy's main supply lines and forcing it to pull its troops out of southern Vietnam. Such tactics were immensely successful in Leyte Gulf and later at Inchon and had a salutary effect on equally stubborn enemies.

Would a truly stern attack on the North bring China into the war? Expert opinion splits sharply over the answer. High value would certainly have to be given to that possibility in any plan for enlarging the theater of action. We are already in an undeclared contest of power with Red China and the question that the President has to face up to is whether in the months, immediately ahead he settles for a partial defeat or failure in a war one fully removed from the major enemy, or risks a clash with Red China in order to bring the secondary war under control. My own view is that Mao, should he elect to engage, will do so reluctantly and within cautious limits. He is certainly not likely to force an engagement on terms that will compel the United States to employ its technological advantages at a distance (to use an old-fashioned term). And I find it hard to believe he would dare to send his infantry masses over wretched roads to do battle in southeast Asia, while Chiang Kai-shek waits and watches hopefully close by on the sea flank, with a spirited army of 400,000 men and the sharpest, most experienced, small air force in the world.

THE BIG BLUE-WATER CHIPS

It is, I suggest, the looming struggle with Red China that we Americans must keep in the forefront of our minds as we grope for the right mixture of political and military strategy for ending the mischief in Vietnam. This is why the map shown at the start of this report now grows luminous with meaning. Now, while hoping for a satisfactory outcome in the going war, we should be sensibly preparing the dispositions we shall need if it turns out badly.

The huge naval base at Subic Bay with its fine runways and the Air Force's runways, repair shops, and storage facilities at Clark Field in the Philippines are indispensable for any forward strategy in the Pacific. It stands to reason that the British air establishment and truly superb naval base at Singapore, all greatly refurbished in the past decade, are also crucial for the control of the Pacific sea routes and the approaches to Australia and New Zealand. Hundreds of millions of U.S. dollars have been invested in air and sea facilities in Okinawa and Japan. And Japan must itself be persuaded to become the north hinge of any grand strategy scheme in the Pacific.

Then, too, there is Thailand, which has generously opened its geography for new jet airfields. This to me is the most stunning recent development of all. It could have the effect of transforming Thailand from being a weak ground flank on the U.S. position in South Vietnam into becoming the main air-strike position, of which South Vietnam becomes the weak ground flank. And, finally, there are South Korea and Taiwan, the only other friendly countries in the area with large, ready, experienced forces. It seems to me our diplomacy should be cultivating this vast garden with more assiduity than it has shown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

NATIONAL AMERICAN LEGION BASEBALL WEEK—LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31 through September 6, 1965, as "National American Legion Baseball Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the joint resolution.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, for the next few minutes, I shall address myself to a question of deep concern to many of us. It relates to the crisis in Vietnam and to academic freedom. As far apart as those two subjects might seem to be at first glance, they have indeed become joined.

Since February of this year, the Nation has been engaged in what may truly be described as a great debate. The subject of this great debate is our future course of action in southeast Asia and the Far East, in general. Indeed, the basic question really is not really the propriety of our action in Vietnam, but

what course will serve the United States in the Near East in the next decade. The outcome of the debate will undoubtedly shape the future of the entire world for years to come.

As in any great debate, there is an unfortunate tendency for arguments to polarize, for rhetoric and bombast sometimes to replace logic and reason, and for the development of feelings of distrust and alienation for those who disagree with the viewpoint you happen to hold. This is probably a natural development given the nature of human behavior, but it can have some very unfortunate repercussions. In this context I would like to examine today what I believe are the beginnings of a protest movement that may have serious consequences for our American traditions and for free inquiry in our society. This has to do with academic freedom.

In the past few years, much to my personal gratification, the university and college students of the Nation have begun to take an increased interest in the state of the Nation around them. For the years following the Korean war, 15 years ago, it had been difficult to interest students in the affairs of the Nation. They were interested in their personal surroundings and in the search for a job with status and security. But in recent years—sparked in large part, in the beginning at least, by the magnetic personality and shining example of the late President John Kennedy, and continued by the leadership of President Johnson, the younger generation of students of America have become interested in the world around them. They have worked long and hard in the civil rights movement, in helping to teach and train the dropouts and the children of the poor and neglected minorities, and in projects too numerous to mention which aim at the improvement of society. It is from the ranks of our college students that we have drawn the majority of the recruits for the Peace Corps. And in that endeavor they have justly earned and received the acclaim not only of a great portion of our people at home, but, indeed, of the world.

And now, in the great debate on Vietnam, the students have entered these lists with the enthusiasm typical of all their endeavors. And on this issue, they have been joined, again as seldom before in recent history, by the members of our college faculties. All across the Nation we see the results of this interest, this concern for the shape of tomorrow. A new word—"teach-in"—signifies a tactic to generate interest and enthusiasm and, I hope, instill knowledge. To this ferment I add my wholehearted and complete support, even though in many of the teach-ins, I hasten to add, I have been the object of much criticism because of my position that the United States should stand firm and strong in Vietnam. Yet in endorsing this new flurry of activity on the campus, I am well aware that this movement and its manifestations across the country represent no Arcadian discourse with student and teacher contemplating the problems of state in the calm surroundings of the

Halls of Ivy. I know full well that this debate has taken on many of the aspects of a protest movement on the campus, that in this movement there are professional revolutionaries and malcontents as well as bona fide academics and students. I realize that perhaps there are even a few persons who might think they take orders from Moscow or Peking and are working to turn this activity to their advantage. And, too, there may be found in this movement on the campus a few individuals whose mode of dress and whose lack of enthusiasm for bathing cause concern among more traditional members of society. These are all facts which I acknowledge.

But emerging from the emotional extremes of the controversy on Vietnam have been harsh charges and even more dangerous assumptions from fringe groups on both sides. There have been certain groups on a few campuses, for example, who sought to shut out debate and controversy and to conduct a monolog their way. As these critics have attacked our Nation's policies in Vietnam, they have described the policymakers as "new imperialists," "power-mad militarists," and "warmongers" out to conquer the world.

In the Senate earlier this year, I suggested that the campus debates would be better received and would better serve the traditional concepts of the academic world if dissent on this issue among the academics was not only tolerated but even encouraged and promoted. Whatever else, in the realm of human knowledge, there has surely emerged full appreciation for the right to be wrong and the right to think "otherwise."

Likewise, I expressed the fear that, if the campuses did not make a conscious effort to maintain a dialog rather than a monolog, the consequence would be a distortion of the true face of the modern American college campus today. In all fairness, the voices from the campus have not been nearly as one sided as the headlines in the newscasts would suggest. We all know that protest often gathers more attention than support. Willfully or otherwise, there has been a distortion of the state of mind in the Halls of Ivy. The fact remains that the vociferousness of the protests from both students and faculty have succeeded in exciting those who peddle patriotism professionally as well as those who may be wrongfully disturbed by the origins of the dissent.

What concerns me is that this normal, if sometimes wrongheaded, ferment on the campus is already being seized upon as an excuse to launch new witch hunts, new predatory forays into the realm of academic freedom—all in the name of Americanism, of course, but with the purpose of stifling the differing points of view. It threatens, in fact, to shut the doors on free inquiry and free expression.

Given then the reemergence of extremist groups in our country during the past few years, it should not be especially surprising that the anxieties engendered by Vietnam, when added to the already existing atmosphere of hate, smear, and fear should increase the

tempo of fringe groups both to the left and the right. The classroom in particular has always been an area of suspicion in their lexicon of conspiracy, and thus it is not unusual—and certainly not unexpected—that it becomes a prime target now. The cases of new attacks being launched against the campus are becoming numerous enough, however, to cause us all to become concerned lest it get out of hand.

It is more than a little disturbing that a teach-in on the campus of the University of Miami in Florida not long ago should evoke the use of one of the newer weapons of the extreme rightwing. This is the recorded telephone message. Reportedly begun by a medical doctor, Dr. W. C. Douglas, of Sarasota, Fla., this device plays back messages from a program entitled "Let Freedom Ring" and can be connected to any telephone exchange around the country—and, in fact, is so connected. It has become a tool of extremists coast to coast with the advantage that, until now at least, it has not been the subject of regulation by the Federal Communications Commission. In the University of Miami case, people throughout the community were called by unnamed voices the night after the teach-in and asked if they knew what was going on on the campus and that if they did not know, to dial 221-6767. Upon dialing that number, a woman's recorded voice said, in part, as follows:

This is "Let Freedom Ring." Last Tuesday night, at Miami's own little red schoolhouse, there was a strange assortment of pinks, punks, beatniks, and leftwing educators assembled for the unashamed purpose of pleading for a soft line against the Communists.

An extended diatribe then proceeded to link anyone who had participated in the affair with specifically named individuals who were accused of being Socialists, Communists, pacifists, and oddballs. A U.S. Senator who participated was likewise singled out for attack and described as being "shoulder to shoulder with a Marxist who advocates selective assassination."

Finally, the feminine voice concluded the canned message with, "Thank you for calling. Call us Monday for a new weekly message. 'Let Freedom Ring.'"

Needless to say, this sort of irresponsible and reckless mish-mash of character assassination and name-calling readily excites the fears of otherwise well-meaning citizens and sometimes triggers additional actions which threaten to impinge upon fundamental freedoms.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as the Senator knows, these techniques are not limited to this particular kind of situation. Rightwing organizations have been using this technique for some time.

It seems to this Senator that we should take a look at this matter and require people who would use the telephone to transmit recorded messages in this irresponsible manner to identify themselves and make themselves available to be sued for libel and slander, or we should require

that the company should assume responsibility for permitting that kind of message to be transmitted over their wire.

Mr. McGEE. I agree. As the Senator well knows, this is a practice which has been followed rather widely. The technique was originated by Dr. Douglas, of Sarasota. The use of this technique in a case such as I have mentioned is less known and understood than is its general use. In general usage a telephone number is given, whether on the radio, TV, or in the newspaper. When one dials that number, he is furnished with weather, or other information.

When I addressed a group on this subject at a college in California a couple of weeks ago, I recommended that the Senate ought to have a voice in the control of this relatively new development in the peddling of hate and fear without a public consciousness or awareness that it was going on.

I believe that perhaps the appropriate committees of the Senate should take a hard and close look at this procedure.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in my own case, I recall that sometime ago I had urged that this Nation might recommend certain changes in the structure of the United Nations.

Someone put such a recorded message over the New Orleans telephone, advertised in the newspaper to dial a certain number, to "find out about your Senator," or some such thing. The advertisers turned it into propaganda, as though I were trying to turn the United Nations into a part of the Communist conspiracy. In this particular case the people did not identify themselves at all. There were many smears and misrepresentations that came over the telephone wire by means of a recorded message when a person dialed the certain number.

Mr. McGEE. Yes; and I understand that the use of such a recorded message in that way can be obtained for as little as \$40 or \$50 a week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me the telephone company should be required to be responsible in that matter. I have had familiarity with a situation in which the telephone company had tapped its own wires to catch someone who might be using the company's wires to engage in gambling activities, and matters of that sort. If the telephone company can do it in such a case, which is invading the right of privacy to some extent, whenever it leased a wire for use of recorded messages it seems to me it could be held responsible in that regard.

Mr. McGEE. That might be one approach to the problem, without regard to the question of whether that step should properly be taken by the Federal Communications Commission, which has jurisdiction over these matters. Otherwise, I think Congress could enter into the problem by clarifying the situation. What the Senator has suggested might be an approach.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It appears to this Senator that the telephone company first has the responsibility for looking into these matters and seeing whether it should permit the use of its telephone wires for repeated calumnies by means of a recorded message.

Mr. McGEE. My first reaction to that suggestion is that I doubt whether the telephone company could turn down such a request on the ground of context, lest it be the judge of such context. We would then be faced with the problem of someone in the telephone company judging that something which was requested to be sent over its wires was defamatory or was not good in the national interest. So I believe some other judgment should be made, but it would be well to look at all the suggestions as a possible basis to get at the problem.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. With regard to the use of broadcasting facilities, this Senator has had occasion to challenge the right of broadcasting companies to refuse to broadcast election material.

The argument was made that someone might play a scurrilous, last minute trick during the election contest. That has been known to happen. What I said was that while the broadcasting company could, in good conscience, decline to accept such live messages because it did not know what the messages might be, nevertheless when some organization hands the company recorded material, the company could say that it made a proper appeal to persons who felt the same way about supporting a candidate; that it was completely logical to accept such material; and that those who felt the same way about the candidate should have an opportunity to go to the polls and vote for the man they supported. In that particular case I prevailed. It was felt that people could listen to that material and that those who shared that opinion could agree with it.

Mr. McGEE. In other words, they had a choice, and not an echo.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McGEE. A former Member of this body, Senator Harry P. Cain, who now lives in Florida, took occasion to say about this incident: "The attack on the University of Miami and its encouragement for debate and free inquiry among its students and faculty was cowardly, scurrilous, distorted, misleading, and inaccurate." I would add that those shortcomings, however, never deter, or slow down the extremist groups. In fact, they become more often than not their stock in trade, rather than unusual.

But not all of the outbursts of late have come from little-known spokesmen for secret societies. The temptation to find conspirators and plotters in the midst of our complex problems has spilled over into the Halls of Congress. Just recently a Member of the other body questioned whether a professor who had engaged in a teach-in and was critical of the administration's Vietnam policy should be allowed to conduct research supported in part by the Federal Government. To that Congressman, for a professor to continue to receive Federal aid under those circumstances was a "shocking inconsistency." Mr. President, the only thing about this that is "shocking" to me is that the Congressman should question the grant in the first place—and on such grounds. It has always been part

of any Federal involvement in education that such participation did not, should not, and must not involve any attempt to influence the thought or direction of the inquiry. To demand political conformity before hiring whatever talent and training a man may possess to me would establish a precedent which contains the potential for the destruction of our system of higher education and of the academic freedom central to it.

Even more recently another Member of the Congress took up "Let Freedom Ring's" old cliché about "the little red schoolhouse is redder than you think." He deplored the situation on our college campuses where, he contends, communistic beatniks and "foreign-born, fuzzy professors" are destroying the pillars of true Americanism. While I carry no personal brief for the beatniks, I would remind this man that among the great rights dear to our traditions is the right to err, the right to be different, or even the right to be a crackpot. And surely this same Member of the Congress ought to recall the many instances in which our Nation has profited immensely from the arrival of foreign-born professors—either fuzzy ones or otherwise.

Our history is replete with instances of rich returns from newly arrived immigrant scholars like Louis Agassiz, Charles Steinmetz, Carl Schurz, James Audubon, and later Enrico Fermi, Justice Felix Frankfurter, Werner von Braun, and Edward Teller. Another who comes to mind at once, of course, was the absentminded professor who spent a lot of time doodling formulas on the blackboard and came up with one which read, $E=MC^2$. I refer, of course, to Albert Einstein.

To those who are concerned that—as one editorial writer put it—"the cockeyed professors and pacifists and anarchists" are destroying the Nation and the culture that has given them sustenance, I would suggest that while we should not glory in the fact that some dissent on the campus is erratic and irresponsible, to seek to enforce conformity—"thought control" is a better term—upon our institutions of higher learning would do far more damage to our civilization and our Nation than can the fulminations of the most radical of students and professors.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I have had an opportunity to read the excellent speech the Senator from Wyoming is delivering. I commend him for a most thoughtful and timely discussion of this problem. The Senator from Wyoming is a former college professor, and a highly respected member of the profession. He holds a doctoral degree from one of the world's great universities. He discusses one of the most precious rights we have in this country, and one of the most valuable institutions. That is the tradition of academic freedom. Some of the great ideas in the field of science that relate directly to the security of our country and the success of our arms in earlier conflicts have grown out of the interplay

of ideas, on the university campuses of our country.

Our entire society has been enriched and blessed by our free university communities. Therefore, we can take heart from the vigorous defense and definition of the academic community that the Senator from Wyoming makes this afternoon.

I especially commend the Senator for his defense of the teach-ins and the discussions on university campuses of the issue of Vietnam, because I believe that the Senator from Wyoming in one or two instances has been unfairly attacked by some of those whom he is now gracious enough to defend.

Although the Senator from Wyoming and I have not agreed in all instances on the issue of our involvement in Vietnam, I have never for one moment doubted his sincerity and his good faith. Yet in a few instances colleagues in the academic profession have not treated the Senator from Wyoming with proper respect, and have not given him credit for the sincerity and good faith that I know he has on this issue.

Thus, I wish especially to commend him for the graciousness and the breadth of spirit which he displays in the Senate today.

In various periods in our past, we have all deplored the failure of our young college people to speak out on public issues. It was not so many years ago that we were talking about the "lost generation," because of its cynicism, indifference, and lack of conscience about public issues. Some years later, the current generation was referred to as the "silent generation," because it seemed to be so timid, having been somehow intimidated about public issues to the point that it lapsed into silence.

In more recent years, we have heard about the "beat generation," which, supposedly, has no concern with public issues.

I therefore believe that what the Senator is saying on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is cause for hope in that he invites attention to the genuine concern of the young people on our college campuses today over national and international issues. Of course, there will be times when their judgment will be ill-advised, but the important thing is that they are speaking out of their consciences, from their minds, and from their hearts on issues which affect their lives, perhaps more than any of the rest of us. I personally believe that the current college generation is the best informed, most intelligent, and most concerned generation in our history. I commend the Senator from Wyoming once again for his articulate and effective defense of academic freedom.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from South Dakota knows whereof he speaks. He has earned a Ph. D. in history from one of the great institutions of higher learning in this country. He is also a professor of history.

Academic freedom is a phrase that takes on deep meaning to him as being fundamental to the cause of all freedom and free inquiry. He has long remained

July 27, 1965

17674

a stalwart on the floor of the Senate in defense of the kind of basic, deep-running sort of inquiry which academic freedom demands at all times.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is no comfort to believe that the current attacks against the campuses are mere nit-picking assaults that will soon fade away. As our past history long since should have taught us, such small beginnings readily explode into dangerous and distorted assaults on everyone's freedom. Already the campus is being selected not only for those targets of anti-Vietnam advocates, but also for all other suspicious persons and groups convenient to the needs of professional patrioteers. From Vietnam it is a short hop, skip, and jump into looking for all kinds of conspirators, spies, and traitors.

On one State university campus in the West, a professor—identified at one time with SNICK and who has remained an outspoken critic of our Vietnam policy—is under attack from certain self-appointed patriots. Some of them are even demanding that he be fired. On another campus, a 2-year-old law against leftist speakers is currently the source of much antagonism. This statute, enacted by the North Carolina Legislature in 1963, did prohibit Communists and pleaders of the fifth amendment from speaking at any State educational institution. Its substance brings squarely into focus the right of an esteemed faculty and student representatives to invite and to hear speakers at open forums for assessing all points of view, including the extremes of the right, the left, and the middle; conservative, liberal, and moderate, all subject to the tests of truth and the scrutiny of cross-examination. Such public forums in themselves are an integral part of the educational process for preparing students to understand their own democracy and the meaning of our national and personal freedoms.

As a distinguished former member of this body, Dr. Frank Graham, had occasion to say recently when speaking about the Carolina law:

The free market of ideas in the historic American view is a basic part of the American tradition of free enterprise. "Gag laws" repressing the freedom of assembly and speech are expressions of the totalitarian way and are contrary to the American way.

Then, former Senator Graham continues,

The "gag law" is a reflection on the intelligence of youth and the responsible freedom of students in the States' colleges and an expression of a lack of faith in the robustness of democracy.

The North Carolina case is by no means the end of the line. Only last week, just across the border in neighboring Virginia, the Virginia department of one of our larger veterans organizations adopted a resolution urging the State assembly to ban Communist speakers on the campuses. If I may predict, this tendency will intensify rather than abate in the months ahead.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McGEE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I join in commendation of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his excellent speech, and especially for its timing. That is the reason I asked him to yield at the point where he said, "If I may predict, this tendency will intensify rather than abate in the months ahead."

Only just the other day, the majority leader said that in his judgment there was a possibility that we might be involved in war in southeast Asia for 5 years, 10 years, or even longer.

It is clear, on the basis of the conferences now being held at the White House, that developments in Vietnam are going to become more serious, that the casualty lists will grow, that the draft may well be intensified, and that Reserve callups are quite possible. There is every possibility that it will have an effect on the economy. Witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee recently indicated that the prospect of a tax cut next year has been greatly reduced. Of course, that is not much of a sacrifice compared to the sacrifices being made in South Vietnam, but we can expect sacrifices in America to grow.

The war in Vietnam will not become more popular but will become less popular. Perhaps, also, there will be an exacerbation of tempers and temperaments, and of attitudes—and, I am afraid, of a tendency on the part of our people to become less tolerant of those who disagree.

Therefore, I believe that the speech being made by the Senator from Wyoming is vitally important. There is nothing more important in democracy than freedom of speech and freedom of expression.

The Senator from Wyoming is ideally suited to make such a speech. He has been a strong supporter of the administration, but at the same time has spoken up—not just now, but many times in the past—urging a national debate on the matter, and defending those who wish to speak their minds.

I believe that his contribution today is very useful. It is especially important that, unless those like the Senator from Wyoming and others are willing to speak out frequently in defense of those who disagree with the administration, and who speak critically of it, that the situation will become much worse.

The President of the United States has taken the same position that the Senator from Wyoming takes today, by saying that he welcomes criticism; that while he is as human as any other individual, and does not enjoy being criticized himself, nevertheless he recognizes, in this free democracy of ours, that the critic plays an enormously important role.

I commend the Senator on his excellent speech, one that is most important, especially at this time.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his thoughtful remarks. I would only add to them the sobering reminder—and this is so obvi-

ous that it need hardly be said at all—that all of us should be reminded that the Lord never vested in one person or group of persons or party or race or creed all the wisdom or all the right; that the only truism that has emerged in our own national history is that the nearest approach to truth and the closest approach to right is the freedom to disagree, and to hammer out the best possible solutions to the complex problems of our time on the anvil of reason. This is where we test ideas and make sure of the ground that we seek to occupy.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his own contributions and measures. They have been invaluable as we have sought the path of unlimited freedom.

As Americans, we are required once again to take fresh stock of our heritage of freedom and all that it means. To destroy freedom in the name of protecting it does not preserve our national traditions. It betrays them. Yet, there have always been those who would—in the name of liberty—seek to deny it to their opponents. License is no substitute for liberty. We dare not forget that ideas, no matter how unpopular or unwanted, cannot be legislated out of existence. They cannot be silenced by resolutions of a veterans' convention. The only way to defeat an idea is with a better idea. Moreover, neither patriotism nor loyalty can be revoked by legislative edict, nor decreed by administrative order, nor achieved by oath. If they are to endure, they must be inspired, rather than commanded. In sum, it is imperative that we not convert the campus into another tinderbox of vengeful hatreds bent upon destroying the freedom of dissent. The halls of ivy must ever remain the repository for free and unfettered inquiry. The professors call this academic freedom. For all of us it remains the heartbeat of all human freedoms.

Mr. President, although its longevity might deny it, academic freedom has never enjoyed sound health. Throughout Western history it has been subject to frequent attack and has all but succumbed on many occasions either from assault from without or from weakness within. Most of us with campus backgrounds remember only too well the nightmare of the Joseph McCarthy era, when self-appointed thought-police swarmed across the Nation labeling anyone who disagreed with their outlook on life as a Communist. Many innocent persons were subject to merciless and un-American persecution for having the effrontery to have ideas of their own for making judgments independent of those of the grand inquisitors. Mr. President, I hope that it will be a long time before we have to live through another such era of suspicion and distrust, of smear and character assassination, and of human rights and constitutional rights being ignored or even ground under foot.

Colleges and universities have always had to contend with those who wish to proscribe teaching and research with limits reflecting the political and cultural convictions of the time. But I agree with the Supreme Court of this Nation in the thought that "if there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or

petty, can order what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

While I realize that, in some circles to quote from the Supreme Court is ipso facto an admission of an un-American thought in itself, I would further quote from two members of the Court to buttress my argument that there is no freedom more essential to our way of life than academic freedom. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who had academic experience at Harvard, noted in a famous decision that "it is the business of a university to provide that atmosphere which is most conducive to speculation, experiment, and creation. It is an atmosphere in which there prevail 'the four essential freedoms' of a university—to determine for itself on academic grounds who may teach, what may be taught, how it shall be taught, and who may be admitted to study."

To this analysis should be added a statement by Chief Justice Earl Warren. Justice Warren, as I do, believes that "to impose any straitjacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our Nation * * * Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die."

But even as it is essential for us to guard against any restrictions on academic freedom, the academic community itself must remember that this is a two-way street. Academic freedom must be balanced with academic responsibility. How best to strike that wise balance must ever remain within the province of good judgment, but surely it will continue to provoke continuing disagreement and contention—as well it should.

Nowhere is this put better than in the 1940 Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors, a portion of which reads as follows:

The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman.

As a longtime member of the A.A.U.P., I subscribe completely to that declaration.

Even as that principle may be accepted, surely we are realistic enough to know that all freedoms are sometimes abused and that men of every station and occupation tend in moments of excitement and crisis to say things with greater recklessness and impetuosity than with impartiality and dispassion.

But this is no reason to suspend liberty. Clichés about "anticommunism" must never be permitted as a substitute for thinking. Intolerance, be it of the left or the right, is still intolerable.

Even as discipline and restraint are the hallmarks of the effective advocate, and indeed of civilized man, so deviation from those hallmarks reflect human frailties. Thus, as there have been abuses until now, there will inevitably be more; and with the resumption of the new school year scarcely a month from now, these abuses will multiply. But these divergencies and excesses will survive as long as the constant pursuit of truth remains the high standard to which we repair, without regard for risks, without concern for costs.

As we pick our way along the tortuous and troubled pathways into the future, let us hark back to a bit of the eternal wisdom which flowed so generously from the pen of Thomas Jefferson when he wrote in his first inaugural address:

Error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Fe [Signature] [Signature]
HOW TO SAVE LIVES AND POLITICAL FACE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, it now appears that the United States is faced with the distinct possibility of a major land war in Asia. Seventy-five thousand U.S. troops are already there, and it is reported that this number may reach 200,000 by the end of the year and perhaps many more than that by next spring. That would be a force on the scale of the Korean war with the added dimension of a much more elusive enemy. We do not know whether or not such a major American campaign would draw in the main body of the North Vietnam Army—a well-equipped, disciplined force of 350,000 men. If that army were to become involved in the war in the south, a much larger commitment of American forces—perhaps a million men—would be required if our side were to prevail. Also unpredictable is the reaction of China and Russia. Neither do we know what kind of political system would emerge even if we were somehow able to wear down the guerrillas and their allies.

We are talking here, however, of a major war involving thousands of American casualties, the expenditure of billions of dollars, vast bloodshed and destruction for the Vietnamese people, and an uncertain outcome. There are other possible side results of such a war that may be even more serious in the long run than the war itself, including:

First. The worsening of relations between the world's two major nuclear powers, the Soviet Union and the United States.

Second. The strengthening of the most belligerent leadership elements in the Communist world and the weakening of the moderate forces.

Third. The growing conviction in Asia whether justified or not that the United States is a militaristic power with a low regard for the lives of Asiatics and an excessive concern over other people's ideologies and political struggles.

Fourth. The derailment of efforts toward world peace and the improvement of life in the developing countries, to say nothing of its impact on our own hopes for a better society.

The proponents of a large U.S. military effort in Vietnam base their case on the domino theory and their fear of the paper tiger charge. This theory, first propounded by the late John Foster Dulles more than a decade ago, has been the guiding light of the foreign policy establishment ever since.

According to the domino theory, if South Vietnam goes Communist, this will topple Thailand or Cambodia which will then topple Burma, Malaysia, and so on through the list of Asiatic powers including the Philippines, India, Pakistan, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan.

It is not always made clear whether the dominoes are expected to fall because of Chinese aggression or because each country in turn infects its neighbor with the virus of communism. Be that as it may, as the theory goes the United States must stand firm in South Vietnam to prevent the dominoes from falling no matter what the cost.

The related paper tiger theory holds that unless the United States stands firm, we will lose face in the eyes of Asiatics and American power in the Pacific will collapse.

This was the rationale that led Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower to take up the French mantle after France was expelled from French Indochina by Ho Chi Minh in 1954 and other U.S. aid to President Diem to build an anti-Communist barrier in South Vietnam.

Despite the fact that numerous governments have come and gone in Saigon since the fall of Diem in 1963, we have been holding on to that bastion at a steadily mounting cost ever since until we now stand on the brink of a major land war in Asia.

The questions now before us are:

First. Do we continue to accelerate the struggle toward a major war?

Second. Do we call it off and withdraw our forces? or,

Third. Do we consolidate our present position, keep our casualties at a minimum and hold out indefinitely for a negotiated settlement?

A POLICY OF MODERATION—HOLDING THE LINE

I strongly recommend the third course. I urge that we stop the bombing attacks in both North and South Vietnam. Bombing is largely ineffective in a guerrilla war and more often than not kills the wrong people. We should also stop the jungle land skirmishes which subject our soldiers to ambush. Instead, let us consolidate our troops in a holding action in the cities and well-defended enclaves along the coast. We can hold the cities and the coastal enclaves with few

July 27, 1965

17676

casualties and with little likelihood that the Vietcong will attack frontally. Such a plan would provide a haven for anti-Communist progovernment citizens including the religious groups. It would demonstrate that we are not going to be pushed out, thus giving consolation to those who hold the domino theory and fear the paper tiger label. We would by this policy respect our commitment to the various governments in Saigon that have held power since 1954. It is the best strategy for saving both lives and political face—the two most sensitive factors to be considered now.

Furthermore, it is based on the realities of the present political and military map of Vietnam. While we are in control of the cities and the coast, the guerrillas control most of the rural and village areas. To dislodge them would be to destroy in the process thousands of the innocent civilians we are trying to save.

A recent news report described the despair of American officers who arrived in the village of Bagia which our forces recaptured from the Vietcong after 3 days of U.S. bombing, machinegun, and rocket attacks. What the officers found were weeping women holding their dead children or nursing their wounds and burns. The village church and the school had been destroyed; the people who had been considered progovernment were filled with bitterness toward their rescuers. Meanwhile, the handful of Vietcong guerrillas in the village, who were responsible for our attack in the first place, had melted into the jungle and were never found. Surveying the human tragedy in this village an American officer said:

This is why we're going to lose this stupid damn war. It's senseless, just senseless.

A policy of restricting our military efforts in Vietnam to a holding action in the cities and the coastal enclaves will avoid this kind of self-defeating jungle warfare, which we are ill-equipped to fight, but which the other side is best equipped to fight. We can supply, feed and defend the urban and coastal areas with a modest effort and minimum loss of life. This is a strategy that calls primarily for restraint and patience until such time as the Vietcong get it through their heads that we will not be pushed out. I have been critical of our unilateral involvement in Vietnam. I think the original commitment and its acceleration was a mistake. But we made the commitment, and I would be prepared to support the kind of holding action outlined above for as many years as is necessary to reach an acceptable settlement of the struggle.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the distinguished Senator from South Dakota familiar with the original commitment, with exactly what was promised and not promised, by President Eisenhower in his letter of October 23, 1954?

Mr. McGOVERN. My understanding is that in President Eisenhower's letter he stated, in effect, that the United States was prepared to give to the Diem

government in Saigon aid consisting of military advice and presumably some economic and technical assistance, but that the commitment was conditioned on the carrying out of reforms on the part of the government in Saigon.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is quite correct. It was conditioned upon reforms. Those reforms never took place. Instead of reforms, brutal tyranny resulted—the imprisonment of many persons without trial, the execution of others, and widespread suppression—which alienated the possible support which a friendly, progressive, enlightened government, carrying out the reforms which President Eisenhower had in mind, would have secured.

It might be helpful if the Senator would include in his remarks the text of that letter. I shall be glad to furnish him a copy of it. It shows that the offer was tentative in nature. In it President Eisenhower stated that he would send our Ambassador to explore with President Diem, who was then President of the Council of Ministers, how aid could be rendered to make the Government viable so as to resist aggression. There was no firm commitment whatsoever to send our troops there.

This historic fact is important to bear in mind, because this administration has escalated the commitment. I do not share the view of President Johnson that our honor is at stake. "Honor" is a highly emotional word. It is a challenge to all Americans who naturally do not want our national honor violated. There is nothing in the history of the original commitment, which is what President Johnson referred to when he said that three Presidents have promised this aid, to indicate that the commitment was other than a tentative offer of exploration of aid, depending, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, on "standards of performance" by the South Vietnam Government and on reforms. Those reforms have not taken place. Therefore, it would have been perfectly reasonable, when the Diem regime failed to carry out any of those reforms, and when, in addition, it was overthrown—I will not say overthrown with our assistance, but we were not unwilling to see the Diem government overthrown—and since that time, has been followed by one administration after another, none of which had popular support, to assume that whatever commitments had been made could have been considered voided. It is a source of regret to me that that has not been done. It is one of the weaknesses in the administration's positions, and its reiterated assertions about our solemn commitments are not borne out by the facts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator from Alaska that the nature of our commitment today is drastically different from what it was 10 or 11 years ago, or even 1 or 2 years ago. But having made those commitments as recently as a few weeks ago, it is difficult at this point to see how we can easily back away from them.

What I propose today is that we try to respect those commitments with a minimum loss of life and with limitations

designed not only to hold the casualties of our troops at a minimum, but to hold the losses among the people of Vietnam to a minimum.

In a few moments I shall elaborate on the point that we ought not to contend that the fate of the world hangs on the outcome of events in Vietnam.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. I take it that he has read Walter Lippmann's column in this morning's Washington Post?

Mr. McGOVERN. I have and I greatly appreciated the point of view which he expressed so well.

Mr. GRUENING. In effect, Mr. Lippmann expresses what I have been saying on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere for the last year and a half. He disputes the basic assumption on which our present policy is predicated; in other words, he asserts that our security is not in jeopardy by what happens in Vietnam; that we are, in effect, going it all alone; that nothing that happens in Vietnam imperils the safety of the United States; that the freedom we are allegedly protecting falls to exist.

I would add that it seems to me we could comply with such commitments as we made, assuming we made them, without a military force. If a peacekeeping arrangement could be made in Vietnam, the killing on both sides could be stopped. Then plans could be worked out to hold an election, which was promised by the Geneva accords but has never been carried out. We could keep alive the hope of a united South Vietnam and North Vietnam without killing countless people.

We cannot succeed in persuading the people of Vietnam that we are their friends after we have bombed them with napalm to the extent that we have. It will now be next to impossible to create the feeling that we are their friends or that our intentions are what we said they were in the beginning.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Alaska. He will observe, as I outline my ideas, that they are very much in line with what he has just suggested.

THE POLITICAL HAZARDS

The strategy I have suggested—the tightening of our defenses in South Vietnam and the holding of the cities and the enclaves in the coastal area—is a policy that involves primarily political patience and military restraint. It requires that we put the issue of Vietnam in a more reasonable perspective. We must stop talking about it as though the honor of America and our stature in the world depend upon South Vietnam. Our top officials ought to quit preaching that the fate of the human race and the cause of all mankind centers in Saigon. In the first place, it is not true. American military power in the Pacific is largely in the firepower and maneuverability of our 7th Fleet plus our island air bases. That enormous firepower, the mightiest military force in the Pacific, will remain no matter what goes on in Vietnam.

Second, exaggerated talk, front page news reports of almost daily bombing missions, B-52 raids, and daily jungle forays focus excessive attention on the Vietnamese issue both at home and

abroad. This has the effect of diverting attention from much more important issues related to our national interest such as the strengthening of the Atlantic Community, the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, Soviet-American relations, the control of nuclear weapons, and other steps toward peace that promise a better life for the people of the earth. It also wastes energy and talent and planning that we need to concentrate on such crucial countries in Asia as India and Japan.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I want the Senator from South Dakota to know, first of all, that I have read his prepared speech. I interrupt him at this time only because I have a luncheon engagement with constituents which requires me to leave the Chamber soon.

The Senator has my deep admiration. He was one of the first to register his disagreement with the general thrust of American policy in southeast Asia. The Senator has had very little company these past months, during which there has been so much hesitation to speak out, even among those who privately question the wisdom of our course.

The Senator from South Dakota realistically points out that we are deeply involved in southeast Asia, that commitments have been made—whether wisely or unwisely—and that the question before us at this time is, Where do we go from here?

It is with that question that the Senator concerns himself in the remarkable address which he is making on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

His address is in line with the general purpose he has sought to serve. His objective has been to avoid an American involvement in a full-scale land war against Asians on the mainland of Asia. Perhaps it is still possible to avoid such a war. I believe that the President wants very much to avoid it.

The course of action which the Senator from South Dakota has suggested today commends itself strongly to me as a way in which we might still avoid a tragic American involvement in a full-fledged war in southeast Asia, the cost, extent, and consequences of which defy assessment.

I know that the position of the Senator has often been a lonely one. I am happy that newspapers in his own State have, to some extent, realized this and have paid him proper credit for his courage.

The people of South Dakota have reason to be very proud of Senator McGOVERN. With his consent, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, following the remarks of the Senator, an editorial entitled "Sincere Dissenter," published in the Watertown Public Opinion of April 19, 1965; an editorial entitled "Stand for Peace," published in the Daily Republic of March 5, 1965; and an editorial entitled "Time To Review Our Vietnam Policy," published in the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of April 25, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for the position he has taken. I hope that his speech will be widely read and soberly reflected upon by those in the States Department and White House who direct our foreign policy.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President I thank the Senator from Idaho for his encouraging and thoughtful remarks, not only because he is a distinguished and highly regarded member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a recognized voice in the field of foreign policy, but also because the Senator, perhaps better than any other Senator, has consistently enunciated a policy of common-sense with reference to our responsibility in southeast Asia.

The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho—first for the New York Times magazine and then on the Senate floor—in which the Senator warned against the dangers of an overextension of American power in Asia is one of the finest statements made on the larger issues of American foreign policy.

I appreciate the comments of the Senator this afternoon.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his kindness.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I agree with the remark just made by the distinguished Senator from Idaho that the President is searching for a way to peace in Vietnam. He has always been a man of peace and he wants with all his heart to find an honorable settlement to the war in Vietnam. However, the over-emphasis on the need for our growing military presence in southeast Asia by those who insist that the honor of our Nation rests on the future of Vietnam places a very hazardous political foundation under the administration effort. It invites the American people and the world to watch most closely the very area where the chances of a happy outcome are most questionable. This not only distorts an issue of secondary importance beyond its real significance, but it is poor diplomacy and even poorer politics. If we keep insisting that the image of America in the world depends on the politicians and generals of Saigon, we are going to be in bad shape.

President Johnson has a legislative and administrative record that is virtually unprecedented in American history. It ought to be the pride of our country and the envy of the world. But unless members of the foreign policy establishment who do not have to face the electorate quit making Vietnam appear as the top concern of the administration, they will create grave political hazards for a great President and his supporters in the Congress—to say nothing of weakening our country in the eyes of the world.

The Korean war, rightfully or not, destroyed the confidence of millions of Americans in the peacekeeping capacity of the Truman administration. General Eisenhower capitalized on that anxiety and wrecked the presidential bid of Governor Stevenson by pledging to go to Korea and negotiate an end to the fighting. Those opposition politicians such as the minority leader of the House who are

now urging the President to step up the bombing attacks may be speaking with sincere motives. But it is not without passing interest that President Johnson rolled up a landslide victory over Senator Goldwater last fall in considerable part because the overwhelming majority of Americans favored the policy of restraint advocated by the President. The voters rejected Senator Goldwater's prescription for bombing raids and a stepped-up war in Vietnam. It is hardly a political favor to the President at this point to urge him to appease the minority and disappoint the majority by a still larger and larger war effort. Yet, recent public opinion polls indicate that the minority, who supported Senator Goldwater last fall, are more pleased with our accelerating war effort in Vietnam than is the majority who voted so enthusiastically for the President.

Stopping the bombing raids and the daily battles in the jungles, quietly consolidating and holding the enclaves along the coast and in the cities, and reducing the number of exaggerated statements about the importance of Vietnam—these steps will help to quiet much of the clamor and publicity associated with the issue and will help to put it in a more reasonable perspective.

RESULTS OF THE RECOMMENDED HOLDING ACTION

The beneficial results of such a policy of moderation and restraint as I have urged this afternoon are these:

First. It will demonstrate to friend and foe alike that we have the staying power to keep our commitments without needless fanfare and unnecessary bloodshed.

Second. It will enable us to conduct our commitment according to the guidelines that are most practical for us, rather than playing the game according to guerrilla rules, which include the jungle ambush, at which they are the admitted masters.

Third. It will take the Russians out of a dilemma that is pressing them back into a more belligerent alliance with the Chinese.

Fourth. It will ease the pressures on such friendly allies as the Wilson government in Britain.

Fifth. It will remove much of the diplomatic and political hazard for the administration both at home and abroad.

Sixth. It will reduce the necessity of calling up our Reserves and stepping up the draft while saving countless millions of dollars that can be used to improve our society and our economy here at home.

Seventh. It will reduce the danger of world war III and improve the chances for further steps toward peace.

Eighth. Finally, and most significant of all, it is the practical way of saving political face while at the same time holding to a minimum the loss of human life—the lives of our soldiers and the Vietnamese people.

Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion of Senator GRUENING, I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Eisenhower's letter to the president of South Vietnam pledging U.S. aid on October 23, 1954, be printed in the RECORD following the editorials inserted at the request of Senator CHURCH.

17678

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Watertown (S. Dak.) Public Opinion, Apr. 19, 1965]

SINCERE DISSENTER

There are many degrees of political courage, but South Dakota Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN is exhibiting one of the greatest—espousal of the unpopular side of a great national issue, even as his political peers try to shut him up.

The issue: Should the United States become increasingly involved in South Vietnam as the dangers of an escalated war loom greater?

McGovern's stand: No.

He stands fast on this line and hasn't been chary about saying so, even when such personal friends and influential big names as HUBERT HUMPHREY and McGeorge BUNDY have urged him to keep silent on behalf of national unity. McGOVERN keeps right on opposing the U.S. role in Vietnam and doing so out where lots of people see and hear him.

Chicken? Appeaser malcontent? By no means. McGOVERN points out that he is neither a pacifist nor an isolationist but simply, "I don't believe military aid can be used effectively in southeast Asia. The problems there are ones of internal political revolution."

In other words, in the McGovern book, America is charging along a jungle path in Vietnam that is not only militarily futile but very costly and extremely dangerous. He recently told Bucknell University students, "It seems clear that we are now on a spiral of blows and counterblows which could lead to a major war under the worst possible conditions for the United States."

He has recalled his food for peace days and reflected, "The extensive traveling that I did in Asia and Latin America convinced me that the basic problems in these areas are ones of hunger, illiteracy, and bad government. These are the problems we should attack. In South Vietnam we inherited the hostility and mess that came from 50 years of French misrule and exploitation."

McGovern obviously is under no illusions as to the political hazard of his own position. For the junior Senator from a prairie State to so adamantly oppose a major policy and commitment of his own party and administration, and to do it repeatedly, while spurning big brother attempts to shush him, takes a brand of nerve one doesn't see very often these days, particularly not in politics. And to compound it, McGovern displayed something of the same independent attitude when he openly expressed his disappointment over some facets of the administration's new farm program and vowed to work to correct them.

McGovern's views have not prevailed, and it is unlikely that they will. But whether they do or not, the man who endorses them and does so most effectively, has increased his stature among many people for his sincerity, his steadfastness, and his willingness to go for broke in behalf of an ideal he honestly believes is right.

[From the Daily Republic, Mar. 5, 1965]

STAND FOR PEACE

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat of South Dakota, and a small handful of colleagues have taken a courageous stand for a negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam. They are bucking the Johnson administration policy, which has been given strong support by leading Republican Congressmen. The prevailing view is that the United States cannot and will not pull out of the turmoil in southeast Asia, that if a stable South Vietnam government can be established, the military operations against the Communist Vietcong will succeed.

Senator McGOVERN early this week outlined what he called his "minimum terms" for a settlement in a talk at the University of South Dakota. He called for: Closer confederation between North and South Vietnam, with local autonomy; economic ties and railroad links between the two nations; U.S. financial aid in developing the Mekong River Basin; neutralization of both countries, withdrawal on both sides of outside troops and advisers, and no effort made to dictate political ideology; establishment of a U.N. Commission to guarantee national borders, provide police protection, and guarantee fair treatment for tribal groups.

The U.S. effort in South Vietnam has been discouraging ever since President Eisenhower permitted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the late, great advocate of brinkmanship, and the CIA, under his brother, Alan, to intervene through the back door. As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch observed recently, it will be Eisenhower "who will be charged by history with the initial responsibility for our Vietnam military adventure, wherever it may lead."

President Johnson has made the decision that we must remain involved in the conflict, indeed, we must pursue the enemy with more vigor, and carry out reprisals for attacks allegedly engineered by North Vietnam. He could hardly do otherwise in view of the steps initiated in the Eisenhower administration and continued under President Kennedy. Any sudden reverse—a quick withdrawal—could not but lose face for the United States. Those concerned about the possibility of an escalation into a large-scale war, however, are rightfully wondering what the final goal of our southeast Asia policy is. We cannot maintain the status quo indefinitely; we cannot risk World War III by going all out for a military victory, even though we have the strength to do so.

The only sane solution, it seems, is a gradual disengagement from the military operations. That is what Senator McGOVERN and his small group are proposing—encouraging negotiations or mediation looking toward military neutralization. It can be accomplished over a period of time and bring honor, not dishonor, to the United States. President Eisenhower negotiated a settlement in Korea after he took office. It was neither a victory nor a defeat for us. Korea remains split as Vietnam is now, and a U.N. Commission patrols the buffer zone between North and South. The same course of action today is as valid today as it was in 1953, and McGOVERN's group rates public encouragement for their pursuit of a peaceful and honorable settlement.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Apr. 25, 1965]

TIME TO REVIEW OUR VIETNAM POLICY

The expanding military activity in Vietnam is disconcerting and more and more people are beginning to wonder just how and where it will end.

About the developments in Vietnam today is a scene of frustration and uncertainty comparable to that which prevailed while the Korean struggle was underway several years ago.

In respect to Korea, there was confusion about our objectives and our methods. The same attitude exists now.

The conflict in Korea was terminated, happily, before it broadened into a major war. Many like to believe that the Vietnam episode will end similarly. But there's doubt, plus bewilderment, accentuated by the realization the problem seems to become more perplexing week after week.

KEEN PUBLIC INTEREST

This deep concern about Vietnam was very likely the reason why an overflow crowd assembled at luncheon in Nettleton Manor Thursday to hear Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, discuss the matter. The

luncheon was first scheduled to be a small one with members of the public affairs committee and the directors of the chamber of commerce. But so many were eager to be present that the public generally was invited.

Perhaps the interest was intensified by the fact that McGOVERN previously had indicated a difference with the administration on Vietnam policy, suggesting that we should explore the possibilities of negotiating a settlement.

In his Thursday speech here, he explained why he considered negotiation both desirable and feasible. And, judging from the reception he received and the close attention paid to his remarks, there were many in the audience who shared his opinion.

THE ALTERNATIVES

The question about alternatives naturally arises. If we don't negotiate, what do we do?

One answer is to say we should either go into Vietnam with great enough strength to smash the opposition. Another is that we should withdraw.

Flaws can be found, however, with both of these suggestions.

If we go into the conflict with a full determination to smash the opposition, we invite sharp retaliation from both Red China and Russia. And that means moving right to the brink of major war and perhaps over it. We faced the same problem in Korea and our leaders wisely refrained from taking that gamble.

The other prospect—that of withdrawal—is also inadequate. If we do so, it may be maintained through the Asiatic southeast that we are, as the Red Chinese insist, just "a paper tiger." Withdrawal would be heralded widely as an American defeat and a Red Chinese triumph and it could be charged that we had deserted those who had depended on us.

WE DO HAVE STRENGTH

Between the two alternatives—an all-out smash or withdrawal—is the possibility of negotiation.

There are those who say that this isn't the time for a discussion of that and we should wait until we are ready to negotiate from strength. This means, of course, after we have beaten North Vietnam into a state of at least partial submission.

One may be sure, though, that the Red Chinese also may be reluctant to allow us to acquire this so-called position of strength. There will be growing resistance.

But what seems to be overlooked by many is that we are right now, as Senator McGOVERN pointed out Thursday, in a position to negotiate from strength.

We have the power in the Pacific and Asiatic waters to smash Red China to bits. The Red Chinese know this. And when you have that kind of strength behind you, you aren't negotiating from a position of weakness. We could approach the conference table with some mighty powerful cards on our side and those negotiating with us would be well aware of this.

WHAT WE DID IN KOREA

Every major step taken in this extraordinary day and age involves, of course, a calculated risk.

That was the case when President Eisenhower aided in the negotiation of the settlement in Korea. But the fighting was stopped and our prestige was unharmed.

It is entirely possible that the same step can be taken in respect to Vietnam. With proper negotiation, very likely something can be done to maintain a degree of prestige on both sides.

Just what can be done in respect to the self-government of Vietnam is, I grant, a disturbing problem. The Government has changed freely there even under our supervision and may shift just as readily in the future.

OPEN MINDS NEEDED

What may be said in general is that the whole situation is so confusing that it is well that our minds be kept open. Negotiation may or may not be the answer but surely we should explore its possibilities in complete detail.

We are heading directly, as someone said the other day, along a collision course with Red China. Let's utilize the power of our strength to try to make a change before it is too late.

F. C. CHRISTOPHERSON.

EXHIBIT 2

AID TO THE STATE OF VIETNAM

(Message from the President of the United States to the President of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam, Oct. 23, 1954)¹

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have been following with great interest the course of developments in Vietnam, particularly since the conclusion of the conference at Geneva. The implications of the agreement concerning Vietnam have caused grave concern regarding the future of a country temporarily divided by an artificial military grouping, weakened by a long and exhausting war, and faced with enemies without and by their subversive collaborators within.

Your recent requests for aid to assist in the formidable project of the movement of several hundred thousand loyal Vietnamese citizens away from areas which are passing under a de facto rule and political ideology which they abhor, are being fulfilled. I am glad that the United States is able to assist in this humanitarian effort.

We have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective and to make a greater contribution to the welfare and stability of the Government of Vietnam. I am, accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador to Vietnam, to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of government how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid were supplied.

The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government. Such a government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalist aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective in performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] made what in my opinion was an extremely well considered and carefully thought out speech on the subject of how to save lives and political face in Vietnam.

He gave me the opportunity to read the speech before he delivered it. I regret that I was not on the floor at the time he delivered it. I hope every Member of the Senate and also the leaders of the Johnson administration, including the

¹ Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 15, 1954, pp. 735-736.

President himself, will take the few minutes necessary to read this analysis of our situation in Vietnam as presented by the Senator from South Dakota.

To me, his arguments are unanswerable. We all know that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whom I see on the floor, has advocated a point of view which a few favor. There have been many traditionalists on the floor who have supported the position of the President of the United States. I find myself somewhere in between those two positions, although the Senator from Oregon may correct me if I do not properly present his point of view.

I go 100 percent with Senator McGOVERN in his recommendation that we should consolidate our present position in Vietnam, keep our casualties at a minimum, hold out indefinitely in certain strong points, backed, I imagine, as a matter of precaution, by the sea, and well fortified, from which we could not be dislodged. I believe this course of conduct is the wisest one to pursue, as opposed to what certain people have represented as the scuttle-and-run-program, on the one hand, or, on the other, to accelerate the struggle toward a major world war, or even, for that matter, to accelerate the struggle so that coffins will begin to come back to us with American boys in them, by the hundreds and perhaps thousands, as we make what seems to me to be a very unwise effort to recapture a certain amount of real estate which has very little actual value to the United States, and also very little practical or even symbolic value.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for what he has said. I particularly invite the attention of Senators to his comment with respect to our national honor. He says:

The overemphasis of the need for our presence in southeast Asia by some people who insist that the honor of our Nation rests on the future of Vietnam places a very tenuous and hazardous political foundation under the administration effort.

It has been said many times that we are merely following a policy laid down by three Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—in defending our national honor.

Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I undertook to mention this subject. My comments appear at page 17195 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I asked a series of questions which I indicated I hoped the President of the United States would answer when he completes his review of the situation in South Vietnam and comes down to tell Congress and the American people what he thinks should be done.

The first question I asked was: "Is it really true that our national honor is at stake in South Vietnam, and if so, why?"

I do not want to close my mind on this subject, but from what I have heard so far and from whatever analysis I have been able to make in connection with my own ethical sense, I do not see any basis whatever on which we are presently committed to fight a major land war on the land mass of Asia in defense of our national honor.

We never undertook during the days

when President Eisenhower was in the White House to do any such thing; and we never undertook during the days when President Kennedy was in the White House to do so. All we said was that we would help the South Vietnamese with financial aid and military advice. That we have done. That we can continue to do.

I cannot see that any of the commitments made by the Johnson administration would lead to the conclusion that, as one government succeeds another in Saigon, as we find more and more irresponsible individuals coming to the head of that government—and I may say, more and more dictator-like types coming to the head of that government—we must commit more and more American boys to combat.

As I indicated a moment ago in colloquy with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I cannot see how our national honor is involved.

Perhaps I am obtuse. If so, maybe the supporters of an accelerated war in the Senate will explain how our national honor is involved.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], with great stress, spoke about the impact on the South Vietnamese people of the combined air attacks, mortar fire, and machinegun attacks we are making to recapture certain villages.

What is this real estate we deem so important to take?

The Senator from South Dakota refers to the news report referring to the area around the village of Bagia, which our forces recently captured from the Vietcong after 3 days of bitter fighting.

Mr. President, it has often been said that this is a dirty war; and indeed it is. What we are interested in, it seems to me, is an effort to maintain a situation in which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own fate. For that reason I agree we should not scuttle and run. I do not think we can pull out.

But on the other hand I do not think we are doing ourselves or the people of South Vietnam any good—and I do not believe we are doing the cause of freedom any good—by a military effort which results in killing women and children to recapture a certain amount of useless real estate.

Mr. President, the newspapers this morning carry a series of shocking pictures showing the torturing of Vietcong prisoners by members of the South Vietnam Army.

I have long regretted that we are unable to get in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pictorial material which is so important for understanding. There are also magnificent cartoons which in a few short lines, in a few short words, can describe a particular situation so much better than we in the Senate can in speaking 1, 2, or 3 hours.

The Philadelphia Inquirer this morning has a picture on its front page and in the caption it is stated:

Vietnamese soldier beats a captured Vietcong guerrilla during interrogation after a major assault on Tetam Loc village in South Vietnam.

The Washington Post this morning has 3 pictures on page A-10 and the captions are "Grilling of Vietcong suspects can involve torture. At left, a U.S. marine rounds up suspects after capture near Tamloc, 40 miles southeast of Danang. A suspect, who later revealed an arms cache, gasps for breath above, as South Vietnamese soldier pours water on cloth held over nose and mouth. Militia beat other captured suspects."

In the New York Times this morning, page 7, there are three pictures under the caption, "South Vietnamese Use Sticks and Water in Interrogating Suspects." The first caption is:

One of 13 men captured by South Vietnamese soldiers in Tamloc area, southeast of Danang, is beaten by questioner.

The second caption is:

After placing a cloth over this man's face, the soldiers pour water on him, as a further inducement for him to talk. He finally told where two shotguns were hidden.

The third has a caption:

Another of the 13 is beaten as the interrogators seek to obtain information about locations of guerrillas and arms.

Mr. President, I know that if we had a complete pictorial display, there would probably be 10 pictures of torturing by the Vietcong of South Vietnamese and Americans also for everyone punished or tortured by the South Vietnamese, or the Vietcong guerrillas.

But, after all, what are we fighting for? We are fighting for the freedom of people to determine their own way of life, and we are fighting, to some extent—and I make the statement in all seriousness—we are fighting to keep America in the eyes of the rest of the world, a nation which has a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

The type of warfare we are fighting in South Vietnam today I feel very much is destroying in the eyes of the world the view that America has a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, which was the major, or one of the major, bases of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I commend my friend from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] not only for what he said, but his courage in saying it.

I hope before the President comes to Congress and the country with his recommendation for further action, he will give prayerful thought to the viewpoint of the Senator from South Dakota, who, I say, does not stand alone on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR EXPANDED AND ACCELERATED SALINE WATER RESEARCH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, whether or not, as Henry Thoreau once

said, "Water is the only drink for a wise man," it is certainly the necessary drink for all men, all life. Yet, today, demand for this vital resource is beginning to outstrip supply in many areas. Around the corner is a future of crippling thirst if prompt steps are not taken to tap new reservoirs of potable water.

Even as we meet in this Chamber, water is being rationed in New York City, portions of New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and elsewhere in the heavily populated Northeast. In New York City, for example, washing of cars, filling of private swimming pools, and watering of lawns is prohibited. Citizens are being urged to take brief showers instead of baths, and restaurants are subject to fine should a waiter fill a water glass before being requested to do so by a patron.

Recently there have been front page articles in the Washington newspapers pointing out that salt intrusion in the depleted Delaware River is approaching perilously close to the water intake pipes at Philadelphia. The Delaware River Water Commission has directed New York to release badly needed water into the river to avert a disaster to her neighbor city many miles downstream.

But, these are only local indications of a pressing national and international problem.

Throughout the United States it is estimated that daily water consumption this year will average 359 billion gallons. Water use in this Nation is growing at the alarming rate of 25,000 gallons per minute.

By 1970, we will be using 400 billion gallons of water every day. By 1975, the figure will exceed 453 billion gallons daily—a demanding deadline.

Think, if you will, of the typical water requirements of the United States for domestic use alone. Each time a toilet is flushed, seven gallons of water are used. The average person taking a 5-minute shower will drench himself in 25 gallons of water. Springling a lawn for 1 hour takes 300 gallons.

Agriculturally, water requirements are higher. Production of 1 pound of beef necessitates the use of 3,750 gallons of water—200,000 gallons are needed to produce 1 ton of alfalfa. A single slice of bread takes 37 gallons.

In the field of industry, the production of 1 ton of acetate requires 240,000 gallons of water. It takes 650,000 gallons to make a ton of synthetic rubber. To produce 100 barrels of synthetic fuel from coal requires the staggering total of 1,115,000 gallons of water.

Elsewhere in the world, the situation is no better even though many nations use substantially less water per capita than does the United States. The United Nations last year completed a survey of the water use and future water needs of more than 40 countries. The report, entitled "Water Desalination in Developing Countries", stated in part:

From the official and unofficial estimates of future fresh water requirements in the countries and areas surveyed, it becomes apparent that substantial increases may be expected in water demand over the course of the next decade.

This report points out, for example, that potable water requirements in

Mauritania are expected to jump 533 percent by 1975. Those in India will increase by 584 percent by 1970. Jordan's requirement will increase 505 percent by 1972, and on the Island of Margarita in Venezuela, requirements will increase 294 percent by 1986.

In Israel, effective utilization of the last drop of available water already approaches 100 percent. Yet, by 1970, that nation will be needing 20 percent more of this precious liquid than she is now using.

Mr. President, the specter of thirsty cities and parched fields should—by itself—be enough to spur prompt remedial action; and, this is but one aspect of a critical water supply situation.

In the United States, in addition to the areas suffering from actual water shortages, there are others where, although the quantity of water available is sufficient, it is substandard in quality.

Standards set up by the U.S. Public Health Service state that good water should contain no more than 500 parts of dissolved salts per million parts of water. Furthermore, water with more than 1,000 parts per million should not be used for human consumption. Yet, there are hundreds of U.S. communities where the regular municipal water supply contains far more than 500 parts of dissolved salts, and in some cases, the figure runs as high as 3,000 parts or more.

In my own State of Florida, for example, there are 26 municipal water supplies which provide water containing between 1,000 and 3,000 parts of dissolved salts per million parts of water.

Another 28 such supplies serve subdivisions and trailer parks.

In the State of South Dakota, there are 152 sources of water—three-fifths of those in the State—that have salt content between 1,000 and 3,000 parts, and three others range from 3,000 to 10,000 parts per million.

Iowa has 143 supplies between 1,000 and 3,000 and 8 from 3,000 to 10,000.

Arizona, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Texas also are among the States that suffer in this regard.

This problem, and its companion one of inadequate supply, have not gone unnoticed in Washington. Through the years, Congress has generally shown that it stood ready to take whatever steps were necessary to assure that the growth and well-being of America should never be jeopardized by a lack of sparkling, pure water.

By 1952, a bill introduced by the late Clair Engle, of California, then a Member of the House of Representatives, was enacted which authorized \$2 million for a 5-year period to develop a practicable, low-cost means of producing fresh water from sea water and other saline waters. The program initiated by the Engle bill was intended to explore the feasibility of entering into such production on a large-scale basis.

Under the provisions of this act, the Secretary of the Interior established the Office of Saline Water to develop new or improved conversion processes by means of research grants and contracts; to conduct research and technical development work; to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs; and to de-

termine the best plant designs and conditions of operations.

During its first year of existence, the Office of Saline Water worked with an appropriation of just \$175,000. It did not take long, however, to realize that \$2 million and 5 years were not going to be sufficient to come anywhere close to doing the job, and so the Congress moved again, amending the original act in 1955, and in 1958, authorizing a demonstration plant program.

Shortly after his inauguration in 1961, President Kennedy came to Capitol Hill requesting still more sweeping saline water legislation. In a special message to Congress on natural resources, he stated:

No water resources program is of greater long-range importance * * * than our efforts to find an effective and economical way to convert from the world's greatest, cheapest natural resources—our oceans—water fit for consumption in the home and by industry.

Heeding the President's words, the House and Senate passed that same year the Anderson-Aspinall Act which authorized \$75 million for an expanded and accelerated program of basic and applied research.

President Johnson has shown no less enthusiasm than his predecessor for the saline water conversion program. While serving as majority leader of the Senate, the President introduced in 1960 a bill which later became the basis for the Anderson-Aspinall Act of the following year.

Last summer, President Johnson gave further evidence of his strong backing of this program by directing Secretary of the Interior Udall to formulate an imaginative and aggressive program to hasten the day when desalting of water will help to solve impending and actual shortages. The report of Secretary Udall was sent to the White House in September.

In his letter transmitting the report, the Secretary stated that it presented "a broad-gage program designed to improve technology and lower the cost of desalted water. It provides an accelerated effort designed to develop large-scale dual-purpose distillation plants in a reasonable period of time." Secretary Udall noted further that in addition to the large-scale plants that will be needed, steps will have to be taken to develop economical processes that will meet the growing requirements of small communities.

He also said that the proposed program is directed toward meeting anticipated needs for desalting both here and abroad. It should enable the United States to fulfill the promise to share the results of this vital work with other nations for the benefit of mankind.

Included in the recommendations made to the President by Secretary Udall are the following:

That the Anderson-Aspinall act be extended through fiscal 1972 with authorized expenditures increased by \$200 million along with clarification of authority to build experimental facilities.

That congressional authority be requested at the proper time to provide assistance for the construction of modal and prototype plants that must be built

in order to test the economic and operational capabilities of different processes and techniques.

That development of large evaporators be accelerated by a program of conceptual design studies, and that a west coast center be started for the testing of full-size modules and components.

That plans be made to have construction started in 1967 of at least one dual-purpose distillation plant in the intermediate range—approximately 50 million gallons per day. I might note here that I am informed that the Interior Department already has issued several contracts for conceptual design studies for a large-scale plant, and that additional design contracts will be awarded soon.

That a substantial increase be made in the research effort to create entirely new desalting techniques, improve tested distillation processes, and to explore the promising reverse osmosis process.

Mr. President, the Senate lost no time in responding to these requests. Exhaustive hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and prompt floor approval was given to S. 24, which calls for a 5-year extension of the saline water conversion program and an increase in funds of \$200 million.

On the other side of the Capitol, however, the House passed a bill that would give the Office of Saline Water an additional authorization of only \$10 million for fiscal 1967 and would not—at this time, at least—extend the life of the program beyond next year.

The Office of Saline Water is now geared to a 5-year program, and the path this program would take has been charted in broad form in testimony before various legislative committees. The steps on this path from basic research through the laboratories, bench-scale stages, and pilot plants are arduous ones to travel requiring a minimum of 30 months and, in some cases, as much as 3 to 4 years. It would be difficult, therefore, to plan efficiently for the future without the solid knowledge that the desalting program will continue its forward motion at the stepped-up pace authorized by S. 24.

The interest and participation of private industry and research organizations, so vital to the accomplishment of our goals, might well be discouraged should Congress suddenly demonstrate an indifferent or negative attitude.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that "you never miss the water till the well runs dry." Since its inception, the activities of the Office of Saline Water has been directed toward assuring that the well will always give in abundance.

Even at this stage, their research has proven fruitful.

In my own State of Florida, a small experimental desalting plant operated for a time in St. Petersburg. More recently, studies have been underway to determine whether a dual-purpose facility—providing both electricity and converted water—would be feasible for

the water-short Florida Keys, now served by an overburdened pipeline that has to bring fresh water 140 miles from wells near Florida City.

Only this week, the Community Facilities Administration announced approval of a \$4,446,000 loan to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission for construction of a plant capable of desalting over 2 million gallons of ocean water a day. By next year, this plant should be in production.

Last year we saw a far more dramatic example of our saline water conversion program when the Cuban despot Fidel Castro decided to cut off water he was selling to our strategic Naval installation at Guantanamo Bay. Although Castro later offered to restore the water, his offer was rejected, and to make the rejection even more emphatic, the line was cut by Navy personnel. Arrangements were made to start bringing water to the base by ship.

Today, our Naval station is getting two and one quarter million gallons of fresh water a day—but not by tanker. This water is coming from the surrounding sea.

Within a few short weeks after the water line to Guantanamo was cut, the Navy had made arrangements to purchase from the Interior Department a demonstration desalination plant being operated in Point Loma near San Diego, Calif. This plant was shut down in March, dismantled, loaded on board a ship, and by July 26, was again in operation producing 750,000 gallons of fresh water daily at Guantanamo. Since that time, the Navy has purchased and installed at the base two more plants similar to the first, and the base is now self-sufficient from a fresh water standpoint.

This is but one aspect of the impact that the fruits of saline water research have had on our international relations.

Earlier this year, President Johnson said:

Water should never be a cause of war—it should always be a force for peace.

In the spirit of this statement, an agreement was signed last November in Moscow calling for cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union in the field of desalting. This agreement provides for an exchange of information, symposia, scientific meetings, and reciprocal visits to installations in both Nations. A team of Soviet scientists traveled here last summer, and a group of our own scientists went to Russia last November.

Secretary Udall later reported that the technical exchange was open and free, and his science adviser, Dr. John C. Calhoun, Jr., said that while the Russians have much to learn from the United States in the field of desalting, our Nation can also learn from them.

A joint United States-Israel team has been studying the water problems of that nation and has indicated that a nuclear fueled electric power and desalting plant would offer an attractive solution to Israel's short-term water problems and at

July 27, 1965

the same time make a significant contribution to the development of the art of desalting. The two Governments will soon announce the selection of an engineering firm to make a detailed technical and economic feasibility study.

Mr. President, in an age when the evidences of present and impending water shortages are everywhere about us, Congress must not fail in its duty to assure a future in which men may freely quench their thirst without fear of drinking the well dry. We must act now, while there is time, so that generations yet unborn will not cry out, as did Coleridge's Ancient Mariner:

Water, water, everywhere * * * nor any drop to drink.

Shortly, House and Senate conferees will meet to work out the differences between their respective saline water bills. I urge wholeheartedly conference adoption of S. 24 as it originally passed the Senate.

Fe [Signature] Mansfield RADIO INTERVIEW WITH GEN. NGUYEN CAO KY, PREMIER OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on July 18, an interview of Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Premier of South Vietnam, which was conducted by Walter Cronkite, was telecast over the CBS network. This was a news event of first importance because this Nation is linked by circumstances and developments with the Cao Ky government which is the latest in a long line of self-ordained governments in Saigon.

I think that due allowance should be made for Gen. Cao Ky's difficulties with the English language. It is not easy to speak, let alone to think extemporaneously in another tongue recently learned. Nevertheless, enough of the General's thought comes through the language barrier to make clear that he has a good deal of personal idealism about Vietnam. He does not confine his idealism, moreover, to South Vietnam as some of our own officials do—as though it were a world apart from North Vietnam. Rather he speaks idealistically of all Vietnam. That is understandable, inasmuch as he is a northern Vietnamese from Hanoi and could hardly be idealistic about the southern portion of Vietnam alone. It is also apparent that the General is hopeful and expectant that the United States will carry a major portion of his idealism by fighting on the perimeter, so to speak, in order that his government will have an opportunity to reorganize the Vietnamese people in the rear, with social justice.

I think it is of great importance that the American people have as much information as is available with regard to those on whose side we stand as well as those to whom we are opposed in this critical situation. From this interview an insight can be obtained into the maturity and wisdom of the present head of the Saigon Government, Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky. I think the interview might also be of particular value to the many officials, military and civilian of this Government, who are concerned with Vietnamese affairs. It should help

them to appreciate more fully, too, that it is not only the infiltrators and planes in recent years which cross the 17th parallel in Vietnam. It has also been crossed, for many centuries, by cultural and other patterns.

I ask unanimous consent that the interview previously referred to be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACE THE NATION

(Special edition as broadcast over the CBS Television Network and the CBS Radio Network, July 18, 1965, 12:30 to 1 p.m.)

Guest: Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, Premier of South Vietnam.

CBS news correspondent: Walter Cronkite. Producers: Ellen Wadley and Robert Quinn.

Director: Robert Vitarelli.

ANNOUNCER. This special edition of "Face the Nation" from Saigon, where top-level talks this weekend may lead to important and far-reaching decisions for the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam.

On the eve of these talks, CBS news correspondent Walter Cronkite recorded this special interview with the man who could hold the key to success or failure.

He is South Vietnam's youthful new Premier, Air Force Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, 36 years old, who took over as head of the South Vietnam Government in June, just a few weeks ago, pledging a new, firm rule aimed at winning the war against the Vietcong and establishing social justice for the people of South Vietnam.

He has banned all demonstrations and strikes, promised death by firing squad to traitors and corrupt officials, closed down several newspapers which he feels were harming morale and, the most popular measure so far, doubled the pay of South Vietnam's soldiers at the front and cut the pay of government officials by half, including his own.

This week, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, one of the chief architects of American policy in Vietnam, met with General Ky and was reported impressed by the Premier's aims to win the support of the people through social and economic reforms. General Ky also urged a major and rapid buildup of American combat troops in South Vietnam. We shall begin the interview with General Ky in just a moment.

Here is CBS news correspondent Walter Cronkite.

Mr. CRONKITE. General Ky, how's the war going?

Premier Ky. Well, concerning military operations, I think the situation is better now.

Mr. CRONKITE. Is the monsoon offensive proving to be as heavy as you feared?

Premier Ky. No, no. That's why I said this seems better now because every, every people, I think, and even the Vietcong, Communists, you know, speak about offensive, rainy season. So. But until now we break all their offensives.

Mr. CRONKITE. Why do you think they have failed so far in this season?

Premier Ky. Because airpower.

Mr. CRONKITE. Airpower?

Premier Ky. Really. I think they—they were a little surprised by air support. I think their first test was Quong-hai battle, and they failed because really we had air support day and night, 24 hours. And with the zone D and down south, all these patterns, they were a little surprised by airpower.

Mr. CRONKITE. Could we win this war with airpower primarily?

Premier Ky. Well, of course, not only with airpower, but airpower is the most important element.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you think it's going to take large numbers of American ground troops to win?

Premier Ky. Not really for winning the war, but I think we need more American troops or allied troops, so thus to allow the Vietnamese troops and the Government of Vietnam to reorganize the rear. In other words, using more Vietnamese troops for this pacification policy.

Mr. CRONKITE. For the allied troops to go out and hold the perimeter defenses while the Vietnamese can rebuild behind them.

Premier Ky. Yes. Right, right.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you have any idea, General, how many troops might be needed?

Premier Ky. We discuss, we study it right now with General Westmoreland, General Co.

Mr. CRONKITE. General, do you have any concern that Americans might take over control of this war?

Premier Ky. No; never.

Mr. CRONKITE. What about the problem of the conflict in command? We hear this discussed frequently. Do you think there will have to become a unified command, or can the present divided authority continue?

Premier Ky. I think at this moment it is not necessary to officialize this coordination that we have already by establishing a joint or unified command because if we do this and then it is good for Communist propaganda. I'm sure that they will say here now—the American war. But now, in the future, if in some cases, we have a big American units involved in operations with the Vietnamese unit but in small number, I think in this—that case we must establish a sort of task force. In other words, a temporary command for a special operations, in a particularly torn area. So, as you know, once you have this task force, if the element involved are American more than Vietnamese and then the commander of this task force must be American.

Mr. CRONKITE. By the same token, then, if the larger force is Vietnamese and there are smaller American units, a Vietnamese commander.

Premier Ky. Mmmmmmm.

Mr. CRONKITE. How long do you think it will take to win the battle in South Vietnam?

Premier Ky. It depends. If really a U.S. Government want to help us or give us everything we need and if really in the next few month or in the future we have a good frank coordination between the two Governments, United States and Vietnam, and without intervention of Red China or North Vietnam, I think within 1 year, the situation will be better.

Mr. CRONKITE. What was that, sir, 1 year?

Premier Ky. 1 year. But really to clean all the Vietcong it's a long, long way yet to go, 3, 4 years.

Mr. CRONKITE. What do you mean when you say give you everything you need. Can you put any kind of a figure on that in manpower or material?

Premier Ky. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. How much, do you have any idea?

Premier Ky. I don't have any idea yet, but right now we are in short many things.

Mr. CRONKITE. What about manpower. How short are you in manpower. You must—you've been fighting this war so long, you've—the number of young men available must be getting very short.

Premier Ky. Well, we—we are not in short of manpower, but the problem for the Government to solve is how to get the participation of the population in the war effort. In other words, how to bring back this confidence in the people. That is the problem of my Government today.

Mr. CRONKITE. And how do you intend to tackle that?

Premier Ky. Justice and really freedom.

Mr. CRONKITE. How, as a practical matter do you do that? I mean, what—what is your program?

Premier Ky. Clean out administration, armed forces, rank, and everything. In other words, banish corruptions, injustice.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, General, how do you expect to accomplish this when the revolutionary governments of the past couple of years haven't been able to?

Premier Ky. I think I mentioned to you, I said the so-called revolutionary governments. That's a big difference because I am not politicians, but I am patriot and revolutionary man.

Mr. CRONKITE. You're going to need some politicians to do that job. Are they going to remain loyal to you while the job gets done? Do they have the same devotion you have?

Premier Ky. Well, sir, I don't need people loyal to me, but I want the people loyal to the country, to my policy, which is very simple. First to give justice and freedom to the people, and then fight the Communists. So, regardless his groups, religions, if they agree with me about this policy, if they are loyal to Vietnam, I always happy to have them helping me. I don't need people loyal to me.

Mr. CRONKITE. General, when do you feel that your program will have been advanced far enough that you can return the country to a constitutional government?

Premier Ky. Well, it depends on the situation military and politics, but with what I can see after 3 weeks now as Premier, I hope that we need 2 or 3 more months to see clearly and then we will decide.

Mr. CRONKITE. Should the American people be concerned about the frequent changes of government in Vietnam?

Premier Ky. Not only the American, but even the Vietnamese people. We are worried, and I can say we are tired of the, you know, so often changes. This fact explains also why at the present time most, or many Vietnamese people, are so indifferent, and I think this fact is very also important and dangerous for us, because when they are indifferent people, it means they will not participate to the war effort. And as I mentioned before, they are indifferent because they are tired of so often changes of government. They cannot believe as, you know, I am sure that you heard about rumors that this Government cannot stay longer than 15 days, and now this deadline is, you know, over 15 days. Now, they said, well, no, no good in 2 months.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you feel pretty confident now that you are going to be able to hold on?

Premier Ky. Personally, yes; why not?

Mr. CRONKITE. General, is there any possibility of negotiation with the Vietcong?

Premier Ky. Well, at the present time I don't see any.

Mr. CRONKITE. Could you—is there any possibility of this policy of yours creating an atmosphere in which you could invite the Vietcong to join you in this effort in your country?

Premier Ky. Yes, I think, yes, because according to the information or intelligence, I think the morale of people, North Vietnam, is affected very much by these air attacks, air raids over North Vietnam. And in some areas, people of North Vietnam are taught that each time we launch an air raid, North Vietnam because somewhere in the South the Vietcong you know, make sabotage, or something like that. So, the people in North Vietnam, in some areas, ask the Communist authorities to stop all this sabotage, South Vietnam, yes. But we know we are quite sure that these air raids and bombs affect very, very much morale of the people, even the morale of the Communist troops. So if we continue or increase these air raids, and if at the same time we can drop or deliver some of our volunteer or some of the members of the friendly liberation of the North, I am

quite sure they will do a good job in enrolling and getting people with them.

Mr. CRONKITE. Was it possible that the Vietcong might just quit and go underground?

Premier Ky. I always said that if Ho Chi-Minh and Communist leaders are smart enough, they will accept this solution, stop fighting and continue in an underground fight. More, more dangerous because at this moment they will give to the free world, to other allied countries the impression that now they are no more aggressors and now South Vietnam is living, you know, in peace and free. This whole impression is more dangerous. That's why we never accept a cease-fire, a so-called, you know, a peace or this temporary peace. We, as General Taylor many times mentioned that we always accept a stop-fight the day that all the Communist soldiers and Asians are out of South Vietnam.

Mr. CRONKITE. Are you concerned that America might negotiate a separate agreement with North Vietnam?

Premier Ky. Never do it.

Mr. CRONKITE. You don't worry about that as a possibility.

Premier Ky. No. There is—no, the ally must not take this decision without the improvement of the Government of Vietnam. Because you know, why we fight Communists for 20 years now, why myself and 3 millions of North Vietnam refugees just left all our land, our houses, North Vietnam to come down here? Because we don't want Red China coming here. Why we in the past, we fought against French? Because we don't want domination, because we want independence.

ANNOUNCER. This special edition of "Face the Nation" will continue in a moment.

General Ky, though Premier of South Vietnam, is a native of Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, and he recently proposed a new plan to hasten the defeat of the Communists there by organizing resistance, a free Vietnamese underground in North Vietnam.

He discussed this plan with Walter Cronkite.

Mr. CRONKITE. I'm very interested in this plan of yours to infiltrate North Vietnam the same way that the Communists have infiltrated South Vietnam. Why hasn't this been done before?

Premier Ky. As I told you, I am not a politician. That's why sometimes my reasoning is very logical. When once you are a politician, you think as politicians—international politics, domestic—sometimes it's very difficult to be logical.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect this plan of yours to be put into effect soon?

Premier Ky. I hope so. I hope so. I hope so.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do your American counterparts think this is a good idea?

Premier Ky. Well, before I had many occasions to discuss this problem with many of my American friends, military Americans. So as you know, as they are military they all agree, even some think that it is necessary to win this war.

Mr. CRONKITE. Going into North Vietnam with a—

Premier Ky. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Democratic liberation front of our own. But do American politicians take a dimmer view of that?

Premier Ky. Well, until now I never had the chance to speak with American politicians, as I hope that in a few days, in the very near future, I will have the chance to discuss this problem.

Mr. CRONKITE. Because you are a military man, because General Taylor, of course, is a military man, you've had an easy dialog with him?

Premier Ky. Yes.

Mr. CRONKITE. Do you expect it to be as easy with a political man, Ambassador Lodge?

Premier Ky. Yes, why not?

Mr. CRONKITE. General Ky, thank you very much, sir. I appreciate your taking the time to meet with us today and to explain your policy.

Premier Ky. Gentlemen, if my voice some day heard by American people, I would like to say something, let them know, I mean the average American, not the Government, not politicians, that we are not a puppet government, that if we fight today not because we just want to fight; not because I am military so my job is fight, fight, no. If someone in this country is tired, tired of war; if the people who really suffer in this country about war, it's military, military, not Saigonese, not the rich man, not the politicians here. We fought for 10 years. We die every day. We suffer from the war. So I can say that more than other people we like—we love peace, but peace in free—freedom—and liberty, not peace under the Communists. So, we are going to fight the Communists until the day we become a freeman or a dead man. So please understand this and help us. If the so-called free people of free countries don't understand or help us, how we can defeat the Communists? That the only thing I want the people to know, and personally, if I accept this job, it is not for, you know, having the title as a Prime Minister or just with the intention to stay here 2, 3 months getting millions of dollars and then some day fly overseas somewhere and living in peace in Washington or Los Angeles or Paris. No, I was born in this country. I'm going to die here for this country, and I'm sure that millions of other Vietnamese are ready to stay and die here for this country. So help us. That's all what I say.

Mr. CRONKITE. Well, let's all hope, General, that the dying will stop very shortly, and so will the Communist aggression. Thank you, sir.

Premier Ky. OK.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am interested that the majority leader, for whose views I have the highest respect, should undertake to insert in the RECORD an interview and to comment generally favorably about the new Chief of State in South Vietnam, General Ky.

I wonder if the Senator has given any consideration to the attitude that General Ky appears to have taken with respect to two subjects which give me grave concern about the validity of his leadership.

The first is his position on civil liberties. I understand that he has set up sandbag barriers in the center of Saigon and that he has had one criminal executed—and no doubt the man deserved to die—and has indicated that in order to bring the price of rice down, he intends to execute speculators without further trial until the price of rice is brought down.

The newspapers this morning carried a gruesome picture of the torturing of Vietcong prisoners by representatives of the South Vietnamese Army. I am as aware as anyone else, of the horrible cruelties which are perpetrated on the South Vietnamese and, whenever they can, on Americans, by the Vietcong. From what I know of General Ky, he is not much better than Ho Chi-Minh with respect to his attitude toward freedom and decency of treatment. Does the Senator care to comment?

July 27, 1965

17684

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall comment, but not in answer to the specific question of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The purpose of putting the interview in the Record was to bring home to the Senate the policies which General Ky is advocating, namely, that American troops should be on the perimeter and that the Vietnamese troops should be in the rear pacifying the villagers.

As much as we can find out about the head of a government, with which we are in a certain sense allied, ought to be put in the Record for the edification and education of all Americans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 448, Senate bill 2300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Fe (M) more
VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, statements on Tuesday by President Johnson in his news conference show that the United States and the world are sliding further into the morass of war.

It is interesting to note that our new escalation is being fortified on the basis of alleged increases in participation in the war by North Vietnam; yet the reaction of much of our own Government suggests infiltration from the North was stepped up in 1964 after American raids on North Vietnam naval bases subsequent to the Tonkin Bay incident.

The latest off of the wire came in just a few moments ago. It reads as follows:

Three F-105 fighter bombers were shot down, the Pentagon reported, by what was described as "intense conventional ground fire" during the low-level attack on two previously undiscovered surface-to-air missile sites about 40 miles northwest of Hanoi.

The two sites, using semimobile equipment which could be put in place in as little as 24 hours, are in addition to five sites previously identified as under construction around Hanoi, the North Vietnamese capital.

The U.S. attack was launched 3 days after a U.S. plane was shot down by fire from one of the missile sites.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester told a news conference that U.S. pilots reported destruction of one of the new sites and damage to the other.

I think there is no doubt that we are galloping toward a major, massive war in Asia. Every action we have taken, we have called retaliation. Every action the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have taken, they have called retaliation. Today's raid on the missile sites is but

another step in the process by which all wars begin.

In today's Washington Post, Walter Lippmann once again sets forth the unhappy, unpromising, and potentially disastrous position of the United States in Vietnam. As I have pointed out ever since our military involvement in Vietnam began, the United States is there alone. This stark fact is not covered up by the recital of token forces, largely noncombatant, that have been contributed by such dependencies of the United States as Taiwan and South Korea.

As Mr. Lippmann once again points out, the real powers of Asia—the large, rich, and populous nations upon whom the long-range stability of Asia depends—are at best unhappy bystanders. Some of them, including Indonesia, Pakistan, and India, are in varying degrees of opposition to our war policy and the most we have obtained from Japan is a lipservice which may not be forthcoming much longer.

It is this failure of the large nations of Asia to support or join our war activity in Vietnam that totally destroys the argument quoted by Mr. Lippmann from the New York Herald Tribune, which depicts the United States as saving the masses of Asia from communism. So far the only "masses" to urge us on have been the ruling factions in Thailand, Malaysia, Taiwan, the Philippines, and the white nations of Australia and New Zealand. Even these have offered little or nothing in tangible support.

What is worse, the more this becomes an American war, the less tangible support we are going to have from them. We have already seen this happen in South Vietnam itself. The efforts of the Secretary of Defense and Ambassador Taylor to increase the ratio of government troops to guerrillas have totally failed. Time after time they announced a stepping up of American military and financial aid to increase the size of the South Vietnam Army. And today, most of the same people who have persistently recommended year after year that with a little more U.S. help, South Vietnam could do the job, are now gathered in Washington to plan the replacement of the South Vietnamese war effort with a total American war effort.

It is clear that the more the South Vietnamese Army is supplied, the larger the number of desertions and the more equipment gets into the hands of the Vietcong. The briefings we receive make it impossible for one to escape the conclusion that the South Vietnamese Army is collapsing at a rapid pace. The war will be increasingly fought with American boys. That is what has been discussed at Camp David and in the precincts of the White House in recent days. That is obvious. It has not been a discussion of the political implications of war in southeast Asia, or of how to gather international support for our policy, or how to make it legal under the United Nations Charter or the U.S. Constitution. The Government continues to stand in defiance of the Constitution, article I, section 8, which places in Con-

gress the responsibility to declare war. Not a word of the Constitution gives the President the power to make war in the absence of a declaration of war, save and except for the short period of time necessary to meet an immediate emergency that threatens the defense of this country and justifies a temporary action by way of self-defense.

The discussions taking place involve the number of American troops that must be landed, where and how, and who shall be called to the colors to prosecute the war that South Vietnam can no longer prosecute.

When the President takes to the air to tell the decisions to the American people, he will not be able to set forth the role of the United States as leader of an allied effort; he will not be able to call upon the American people to join in an allied effort in Vietnam; he will not be able to say that American boys are about to be asked to participate in an operation that the great nations of Asia or the world regard as vital to their security.

All he is going to be able to do is announce the calling up of American military forces to fight for American face and prestige in Asia. He will not even be able to say that they are going there with the blessing of people of Pakistan, India, Japan, or Indonesia, and if he is completely honest with the American people, he will tell them that three of these countries believe we should be waging a political war, not a military war, in Vietnam, and the fourth is going along with the war effort only on the surface of official policy but not at the deep grassroots of its people.

If he is completely honest, he will tell the American people that there is no major support in Asia for what we are about to do, and he will also explain that the more the war becomes an American war, the less popular and effective the United States will be everywhere in Asia. Should the war prove long drawn out, or should North Vietnam or China enter it directly, he should make it perfectly clear that the United States can expect no help whatever from any quarter in Asia, and we will be lucky if many of these countries do not actually turn on us.

We are drawing heavily upon our political capital built up in Asia over a 20-year period and the Americanization of the war will step up the process. Those are the realities of the further American takeover of the war. I hope the President will bring them out. I hope he will offer the people some explanation of why everything we have financed in South Vietnam in the last 3 years has dissolved, why the South Vietnam Army is less interested and less capable now than it was 3 years ago of resisting the Vietcong, and the extent to which we must expect the same process to take place among the other nations of the area.

Let the President also make it clear that no Asians are going to die in Asia for the face, prestige, or security of the United States. If anything, they will more likely die just to get us out, just as they died to get the Dutch, the British and the French out.

CONGRESS MUST REMAIN IN SESSION

One great contribution the President can make to the war effort would be to ask Congress to remain in session at the same time he calls up additional military forces. Certainly it will not set well with the American people to see Congress go home for a vacation at the same time thousands of reservists and guardsmen and draftees are being called to leave civilian life to meet what is described as a crisis situation.

It will not set well with them because that is not the way our Government is supposed to operate. Congress, under our Constitution, is supposed to be a check upon the Executive; for it to dissolve itself just as the Executive leads the country into an "Executive" war would be a repudiation of our constitutional system.

The President should tell the country that he does not expect any sine die adjournment September 1 because the Nation will be in the midst of a growing war crisis this summer and fall and Congress must be on hand to exercise its constitutional function to authorize the raising of an Army and a Navy, to appropriate the money for their maintenance, and to declare war.

That is what the Constitution calls for. Let the Record be perfectly clear that at the Democratic conference held by Democratic Senators some days ago, I took exactly the position in that conference that I am expressing on the floor of the Senate today.

I said then, and I say now, that, in my judgment, Congress could not possibly justify adjourning sine die and going home while American boys are dying in an executive war in Asia.

Congress has the clear constitutional responsibility to stay here and maintain a constant check upon the Chief Executive, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense. We cannot turn this war over to the President of the United States to fight.

The American people have the right to call upon every Member of Congress to stay on the job so long as American boys are dying in Asia. I say most respectfully that we are well paid and have a duty to stay here and earn our money, if we do no more than function in our checking capacity. However, much more needs to be done. We cannot begin to carry out the legislative trust that we owe to the American people by September 1, October 1, November 1, or December 1.

Mr. President, here is one Senator who will not vote under any circumstances for a sine die adjournment resolution this fall. We should stay here and exercise our constitutional responsibility to maintain a constant check upon the operation and the execution of this war. Furthermore, I say most respectfully on the floor of the Senate today, to my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, that, in my judgment, American public opinion will be quite different 60 days from now than it is today. We should at least be in session to respond to that public opinion, for I am satisfied that it will shift, and shift rapidly.

If Congress did not remain in session, it would be running away from its con-

stitutional duty and moral obligations to the American people. When the President sends American boys to face the fire in Vietnam, he should also keep the feet of Congress in the fire here at home, because that is where they belong.

Certainly all those in Congress who have gone along with one endorsement after another of Presidential action in Asia on the expectation that they would be consulted in the future should be on hand in the event the President does decide to consult Congress on the course and extent of the war. How can Congress be consulted, if it is not even in formal session?

What we are headed for in Asia could be disaster. It could well be war with North Vietnam, and it could well be war with China, because war with China is in the minds of a large group of the President's military advisers. Congress can no longer hide behind its pleas that the whole policy in Asia was instigated by Presidents and should be carried out by Presidents, without any sharing by Congress of the responsibility for the policy and its results.

Congress must stop being a rubber-stamp parliament. The war in Asia has gone far beyond the action of a Commander in Chief. It is about to be transformed into a de facto state of war, as the calling up of additional forces will make very clear to the American people. Congress must remain in Washington, in session, if it is to fulfill its constitutional duty.

Although the Pentagon and the State Department do not seem to think there is any serious danger that Russia will enter the war, the senior Senator from Oregon does not share that sense of safety and security. In my judgment, any substantial bombing in Hanoi would kill Russians. There are many Russians in Hanoi. If we started to kill Russians with our bombs, I cannot imagine that Russia would send us greetings and thanks.

Moreover, I cannot listen to the reports from the State Department and particularly from the Pentagon without being satisfied in my own mind that there is a group of preventative war people in the Pentagon who share the views of Hanson Baldwin, who is usually their trial balloonist, that we ought to send a large body of troops into Asia to fight a preventative war against China.

Mr. President, if we should make that great mistake, I do not believe that there is any possibility that Russia could stay out of that war and have any hope at all of maintaining any influence in the Communist segment of the world.

Mr. President, I should like to have my colleagues read very carefully the remarks of Walter Lippmann in his column published in this morning's Washington Post.

Some individuals will consider my statement to be a bit boastful, but the record will speak for itself. There is no premise in the Walter Lippmann article of this morning that the senior Senator from Oregon has not been setting forth in detail in the Senate in speech after speech for 2 years.

I am glad that Mr. Lippmann has emphasized the point of view set forth in the premises of the long series of speeches that I have made in opposition to what I at first called McNamara's war, because McNamara, Taylor, and Lodge were the original blueprinters of that war in Asia. Then, finally, reluctantly, and with dragging feet, the Secretary of State joined them. That made it the McNamara-Rusk war. Then, to his everlasting sorrow, I believe, so far as the future pages of history will show, they brought the President into the war. That made it the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war, which it is today.

Mr. President, in my judgment the observations made by Walter Lippmann in his column of this morning are sound. He has been warning the American people for some time about the great dangers that are likely to develop from the escalation of this war into a massive war in Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Asian War," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in this morning's Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: ASIAN WAR
(By Walter Lippmann)

We are about to pit Americans against Asians on the continent of Asia. Except for the diminishing and disintegrating South Vietnamese army, we have only token or verbal support from any Asian country. No great Asian power, Japan, India, or Pakistan, is allied with us. None of our European allies is contributing anything beyond scattered verbal support. We have no mandate from the United Nations as we had in Korea, none from NATO, none from the nations of this hemisphere.

The situation in which we find ourselves is unprecedented, and the best the administration has been able to achieve by way of approval and support from our own people is a reluctant and depressed acquiescence. For there has been no proof, not even a real attempt to prove, that the security of the United States is vitally threatened in this war as it was, for example, when Hitler was in sight of the conquest of Britain and the capture of the British Fleet, or when Japan with a great navy threatened to command the whole Pacific Ocean including Hawaii and the coast of California.

Nations fight well when they are defending themselves, when, that is to say, they have a vital interest. It is the lack of an American vital interest which explains the current mood of depression and anxiety, which explains why our intervention in southeast Asia has for 10 years been so gingerly, so furtive, so inadequate.

There are in truth two main reasons why we are becoming ever more deeply involved in Vietnam. The first, much the more powerful of the two, is a proud refusal to admit a mistake, to admit the failure of an attempt, begun 10 years ago, to make South Vietnam a pro-American and anti-Chinese state. More than anything else we are fighting to avoid admitting a failure—to put it bluntly, we are fighting to save face.

There is a second reason which weighs heavily with many conscientious people. It is a respectable reason. As stated by the New York Herald Tribune on Sunday:

"We are in Vietnam at the express invitation of the Vietnamese Government; we are fighting there for the Vietnamese people. But we are fighting also for the millions of people in the other threatened lands beyond, people who have not the power to defend themselves from the Chinese colossus, and whose lives, safety and freedom depend on the strong arm of the policeman—which only we can provide."

My own view is that the conception of ourselves as the solitary policeman of mankind is a dangerous form of self-delusion. The United States is quite unable to police the world, and it is dangerous to profess and pretend that we can be the policeman of the world. How many more Dominican Republics can the United States police in this hemisphere? How many Vietnams can the United States defend in Asia?

The believers in America as the world policeman get around these practical difficulties by making an assumption—that what happens in Vietnam will determine what happens elsewhere in Asia, that what happens in the Dominican Republic will determine what happens all over Latin America. This notion of the decisive test in a fallacy. The Korean war, in which we successfully defended South Korea, did not determine the outcome in Indo-China. What we have done in the Dominican Republic will not protect any other Latin American country from the threat of revolution.

Revolutionary wars are indeed dangerous to order and it is baffling to know how to deal with them. But we may be sure that the phenomenon of revolutionary wars, which is latent in all of the underdeveloped regions of the world, cannot be dealt with by American military intervention whenever disorder threatens to overwhelm the constituted authority. On the contrary, it is more likely that in making Vietnam the test of our ability to protect Asia, we shall in fact provide revolutionary China with just the enemy it needs in order to focus popular hatred against us—a white, rich, capitalistic great power. We are allowing ourselves to be cast in the role of the enemy of the miserable and unhappy masses of the emerging nations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "War With China Favored, Opposed," written by Drew Pearson, and published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR WITH CHINA FAVORED, OPPOSED
(By Drew Pearson)

The most important question in the background of the White House huddles over Vietnam is whether we will—or should—get into war with Red China. One group definitely favors war.

Some time ago, certain top Air Force commanders presented the White House with the view that there must be an eventual showdown with Red China, and it would be strategically easier for such a showdown to come now rather than later.

They proposed wiping out Chinese nuclear bases and laboratories this year, before China can become a major nuclear power.

There was some reason to believe that when Khrushchev was in power he would not have objected. Today the situation has changed. The Kremlin has warned us that an attack on China would bring instant Russian retaliation.

Despite this, many Pentagon strategists still argue that the time for a showdown with Red China is now.

The President so far is taking the opposite

view. He has made it clear that he is against the use of nuclear weapons, that he is flatly opposed to escalating the war.

In one session, he pointed out that if we followed the recommendation of Representative GERALD R. FORD, Republican, of Michigan, and bombed Hanoi, the Chinese would retaliate either by sending in massed troops or bombing Saigon. We would then be called upon to retaliate against Peiping and world war would follow.

The President devoutly desires to avoid world war. He is proceeding with extreme caution. He does want to stop the march of communism in southeast Asia, but believes this can be done with a limited war.

ALLIES WORRY

There is always the risk, however, that this limited war will slide into a major conflict, and that is why our allies have been so worried.

Japanese leaders have been among the most persistent in urging the United States to change its policy in South Vietnam.

Many Democrats on Capitol Hill do not agree with our massive commitment in southeast Asia, but they are loyal to the President. A hint of this came out in the recent statement by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, urging that the Russians or the British or any member of the Geneva Treaty Conference (which split up North and South Vietnam in the first place) take the initiative in asking for peace talks.

BAD NEWS FROM SAIGON

Here is some of the distressing news from Saigon that has caused the series of White House huddles over future policy:

The South Vietnamese army is suffering from such wholesale desertions that it is risky to arm it. The arms go over to the Vietcong.

The Saigon Government, always corrupt, always ineffective, might just as well be scrapped.

American popularity once reasonably high, has nosedived. It is now on a par with the anti-French feeling during the long civil war in French Indochina.

Sixty percent of South Vietnam is now in the hands of the Vietcong, with many villages still supposedly loyal to the government probably actually disloyal.

The policy of bombing North Vietnam has been a complete failure. Military supplies have continued to come down from the north.

The above facts show the contrast between war in Vietnam and war in Korea. In the Korean war, the United States was supported by a strong patriotic civilian population that gave full cooperation. We also had the advantage of a Korean army, much of it well trained and willing to fight. There was no problem of an enemy constantly disappearing into the jungle.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this article by Drew Pearson sets forth the conflict that has been going on in the high council of our Government at the executive end of the avenue. However, it is also well that the American people be forewarned, as Pearson has forewarned them in his column of this morning, about the danger of a war with China.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Must Halt This Fiasco," published in the Wheeling News Register of Sunday morning, July 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST HALT THIS FIASCO

From every indication, the United States is about to embark upon a policy in Vietnam which at best will cost the lives of thousands of America's young men and at worst could escalate into a nuclear holocaust which would destroy most of the cities and peoples of the world.

The whole situation has been thoroughly confused by allowing clever phrases to be substituted for simple truth. For example, much has been made over the idea that our involvement in Vietnam has something to do with a "test of national honor" or "our word" being at stake. This is nonsense and it is time that we set the record straight, at least in the minds of our own citizens.

What looms now as massive American commitment did not begin as any such test. It started as a conditional program of aid and support during the Eisenhower administration, with just over 300 American military advisers on the scene. Now we are on the verge of a military buildup there which may exceed the 327,000 Americans who fought in Korea with 142,000 casualties, 1 million reservists and national guardsmen called up and draft calls reaching some 80,000 monthly.

Our phrasemakers have harped so long on the idea that we will meet all requests of the South Vietnamese government for support, that we fail to view that government itself. At the moment that government supposedly is represented by a flamboyant little dictator named Nguyen Cao Ky. He seized power in a military coup while American soldiers fought to stave off the Communists.

Ky has become the 10th Premier of South Vietnam in 20 months and no one can predict how long he will survive. The very thought of supporting Ky is distasteful. Only recently in an interview he said that he had only one hero, Adolph Hitler.

He sports pearl-handled revolvers and purple chokers. His office reflects his character. It is splashed with bright blue flags and curtains. Orange and silver flying helmets cover the walls. He sits and listens to the Beetles from a hi-fi set in the corner while Americans fight through the mud and rain of the monsoons.

Meanwhile the war itself has gone badly. Hamlets and villages by the score are being overrun; strategic district towns are beginning to topple; the pressure is mounting on key provincial capitals. Driving hundreds of refugees before them, the Reds are clogging coastal areas with displaced villagers, adding to already serious economic strains.

All the while our allies are continuing to do business with our enemy. As was reported the other day, the freighters of 6 allied nations sent 74 shiploads of supplies to Communist North Vietnam during the first half of the year. And we talk about "national honor" being at stake.

Up to now this newspaper has supported the policy of President Johnson as expressed last August in New York as follows:

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam."

We cannot go further. We cannot support war or the risk of atomic war without more information than the Government so far has seen fit to disclose. Why has Presidential policy completely changed? What developments have there been since last August which justify the commitment of thousands of American boys to fight and die in the swamps and rice paddies of this remote corner of southeast Asia? What changes in the world situation now justify

the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?

The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward language we all can understand.

It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. President, this constitutes a very interesting shift in editorial policy. We are seeing increasing evidence of this. At long last, American editors are beginning to do their book work. At long last there is increasing evidence that American editors are reading something besides their own newspapers. At long last, there is increasing evidence that American editors are beginning to recognize the increasing danger that the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war is creating in Asia to the security of our country and the peace of the world.

Oh, there have been some editors, from the very beginning, who had the courage to warn the American people of the danger. I refer again to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. These editors have been the most farsighted and courageous of any, with regard to American foreign policy, but they have had some good colleagues for a long time. The editors of the New York Times warned us of the danger of massive war in Asia. There seems to have been at least some silence on their part in the most recent past, but I am satisfied that we cannot escape the conclusions they were setting forth in their editorials for months in regard to the danger of war in southeast Asia.

Special tribute should be paid to Mr. Higgins, the editor of that little fighting newspaper in York, Pa., called the York Gazette. Obviously a keen student, this editor, and a very courageous writer who has been, in editorial after editorial, warning the American people for months of what is going to happen. His predictions have always happened. We cannot start the type of escalation that has been going on in Asia and not escape the fact that we are going to find ourselves in a massive conflict.

I also pay my high respect to the chain of Knight papers, which for many months have been trying to warn the American people that this executive war will threaten and endanger the peace of the world, as well as the ultimate security of the United States.

It is interesting to read what the editor of the Wheeling News-Register said in the editorial which I previously asked to have printed in the Record. He said:

Up to now this newspaper has supported the policy of President Johnson as expressed last August in New York as follows:

"Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf

much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover, such action would offer no solution at all to the real problems of Vietnam."

The senior Senator from Oregon has quoted that statement by the President of the United States, plus the statement he made in Texas, plus the statement he made in New Hampshire during the campaign, all to the effect that he was against sending American boys to do what Asians should do. He has changed his mind. He has a right to change his mind, but the President has never advanced a sound argument in support of changing his mind.

The editorial continues:

We cannot go further. We cannot support war or the risk of atomic war without more information than the Government so far has seen fit to disclose. Why has Presidential policy completely changed? What developments have there been since last August which justify the commitment of thousands of American boys to fight and die in the swamps and rice paddies of this remote corner of southeast Asia? What changes in the world situation now justify the risk of an atomic war throughout the world?

The people of America are entitled to complete information, expressed not in clever phrases or the outright lies, justified by the Defense Department, but in simple straightforward language we all can understand.

It is time our Senators and Congressmen moved to protect their constituents rather than blindly following White House policy. It is time all of us let our views be known through letters and telegrams to our representatives and our President. It very well may be that the future of the world depends upon us.

It is my belief that editorials of that type are going to increase in number in newspaper after newspaper in this country as the American people really come to grips with the awful and ugly reality that is ahead of us unless the war-making policy of the United States in Asia is changed, unless the United States starts living up to its treaty commitments, unless the United States calls for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and announces to the world that we are laying the whole threat of peace to the world before the United Nations for its jurisdiction, and that we will support the United Nations in the course of action that is taken in trying to reach a honorable, negotiated, peace settlement of this threat to the future of all mankind.

I close by saying that yesterday at the Governors' conference in Minneapolis, the Governor of Oregon, Mark O. Hatfield, made a statement which, in my opinion, is deserving of high commendation on the part of the senior Senator from Oregon. I commended the Governor once before for the efficient and effective work he did many months ago in connection with the flood disaster that struck my State of Oregon, back in January and December. Under his responsibility, it was his duty to report immediately to the Federal Government and to the President with regard to what the facts showed. He did. He worked closely with the office of the senior Senator from Oregon. He is worthy of the commendation I gave him. But we have in both parties some very blind partisans who

seem to think one commits a great offense in partisan politics if he recognizes a commendable piece of work that is done by a member of the other party. I have never held to that principle.

Last night, sitting in my living room, watching television, I listened to the statement made over television by Governor Hatfield. I read an account of his statement in the press today. I sent the following telegram to Governor Hatfield:

I listened to you last night on television and also read the newspaper accounts this morning of your statement on American foreign policy in Asia. Congratulations.

You must expect to be criticized for advocating the negotiation of an honorable peace through existing procedures of international law, but the American people should face up to the fact that not even the powerful use of American military might in Asia makes right.

For a long time I have pointed out in the Senate that our Government cannot justify the killing of American soldiers in southeast Asia in an undeclared war. I am proud to stand on that record.

Although some will criticize you for it, I am proud of the statement you made yesterday at the Governors' conference. Regards.

I repeat that, in my opinion, there is a shifting in America, so far as American public opinion is concerned, in attitude in respect to the McNamara-Rusk-Johnson war in Asia. It is my opinion that the time has come—it is long overdue—for a reappraisal by the Congress of the war in Asia. I hope the Congress will stay on the job as long as American boys die in southeast Asia in this undeclared war, and that Congress will proceed to exercise its constitutional responsibility of checking the President in regard to the execution of that war.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2300) authorizing the construction, repair and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, S. 2300, now before the Senate, is the first general river and harbor and flood control bill to come before Congress since 1962.

The Public Works Committee has devoted much time to this proposed legislation. Public hearings covered a period of 4 months, extending from March through June.

Details concerning the recommended improvements have been furnished by the Corps of Engineers.

The committee believes that each project is economically justified, having passed the formula for authorization imposed by the corps.

We believe that the projects are well conceived. Their inception stems from the knowledge possessed by one of the greatest engineering organizations in the country.

Other Federal agencies, equally well qualified, and including the Bureau of the Budget, have reviewed these projects and concurred in their construction.

The inclusion of these projects in the construction program of the Corps of Engineers will be a valuable addition to the works that are now under construction, or are on the drawing boards, for protection from floods and the betterment of navigation.

The projects to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers as a result of this authorization would consist of single- and multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs—levees, flood walls, breakwaters, and channel improvements.

All are in the interest of navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, beach erosion control, and other multiple-purpose water uses.

They will provide needed flood protection to our cities and towns, as well as agricultural areas of the country.

They will enhance the use of the navigable waterways of our Nation which, as we all know, has one of the best harbor and inland waterway systems in the world.

They will provide additional water for domestic as well as industrial uses, augmenting the supply which in many sections of the country is becoming critical.

Hydroelectric power will also be generated at some of the projects recommended in the proposed legislation.

Recreational activities will be enhanced by the adoption of these projects.

All in all, the projects contained in this bill will go far in promoting and developing the Nation's water and land resources.

The projects recommended are the result, in many instances, of requests made by the Members of this body for studies of water resource problems in their States.

The committee asked the Corps of Engineers to look into these problems, and to advise the committee on the best course of action for remedying the situation.

The projects contained in this bill are the answers to these problems.

Highlights of the bill will be of interest to the Senate.

It is, as I mentioned, the first general omnibus bill since 1962.

It would authorize a total of 109 flood control, navigation, beach erosion control, and multiple-purpose improvements, having a total estimated cost of \$1.9 billion.

A portion of this cost will be returned to the Federal Treasury in payments for water supply and recreation by local interests.

The storage space in Federal reservoirs allocated to water supply and recreation—would be paid for by local interests over a period of not to exceed 50 years.

On this basis—the net cost to the United States for construction of these projects would be \$1.8 billion.

While the direct dollar return of the total cost of the projects in the bill would not be great—the overall benefits that will accrue to the Nation will more than offset the costs.

This, of course, does not take into account the human lives that will be saved due to flood protection measures, upon which we cannot place a dollar value.

Certain other functions of the projects, such as flood control and navigation, the cost of which is not reimbursable in cash to the Federal Government, nevertheless, will contribute to the economic growth of the country.

The funds thus expended would be eventually returned with interest to the general public in the form of increased purchasing power.

The \$1.9 billion authorized in the bill does not represent spending for 1 year.

This amount will be budgeted over a period of years on a sound fiscal basis compatible with other needs of the country.

The bill contains works of improvement for construction in 38 States of the Union.

Surveys leading to future projects will be made in a number of other States, in accordance with language that the committee has seen fit to include in the bill.

Section 104 of the bill grants the consent of Congress to construction of a dam by the State of Pennsylvania on the Susquehanna River. This will result in no cost to the Federal Government.

Section 204 would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make loans to those local interests—located in designated depressed areas—who are unable to meet the required local contributions toward the cost of construction of water resource projects.

This will be a valuable provision to assist those communities located in economically depressed areas of the country.

Section 206 as well as 207—would provide for needed comprehensive water resource surveys throughout the Nation.

In closing—I especially wish to thank the members of the Public Works Committee who devoted long hours to the consideration and formulation of this bill.

Also, my appreciation is extended to Gen. Jackson Graham, the Director of Civil Works of the Corps of Engineers, and to his able staff for furnishing the committee with details on the various projects and matters.

I consider the pending bill to be a well conceived and carefully analyzed piece of water resource legislation, and highly recommend its passage.

Mr. President, I offer several amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The first two are in the form of technical amendments merely indicating document numbers for reports which have become available since the bill was reported by the committee.

The other amendment provides for authorization of the navigation project at Cedar River Harbor, Mich.

The amendment offered on this project meets the criteria the committee has set for other projects cleared since the committee met.

The project has the favorable recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and has been cleared by all Federal and State agencies, including the Bureau of the Budget.

The project is necessary in the interest of commercial and recreational fishing, and will also serve as a harbor of refuge. It has an exceedingly high benefit-cost ratio of 1.7 and is well justified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Page 25, line 8, insert the figure "244".

Page 25, line 16, insert the figure "246".

Page 4, following line 23, insert the following:

Cedar River Harbor, Michigan: House Document Numbered —, Eighty-ninth Congress, at an estimated cost of \$664,000;"

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc and, without objection, they are agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator McNAMARA, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, in asking that S. 2300 be passed by the Senate.

As the Senator from Michigan has said, the bill has been the subject of long and thorough consideration over a period of 4 months. The Committee on Public Works gave the bill close scrutiny in comprehensive hearings.

This year the chairman of the committee initiated a new system of hearings, which I believe was helpful and enabled the committee to give fuller consideration than was possible for each project in past years. The chairman established four subcommittees dealing with specific projects in the Atlantic regions, the central regions, the Mississippi-Plains regions, and the Pacific regions.

After the hearings in these special subcommittees had been completed, the full committee went over the bill, item by item, and it was reported unanimously by the Public Works Committee.

As the chairman has noted, the omnibus authorization bill is usually brought before the Senate biennially, but it has been 3 years since a regular omnibus Public Works bill has been before the

and floods aggravated by or due to wind or tidal effects, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, in drainage areas of the United States and its territorial possessions, which include the following named localities: *Provided*, That after the regular or formal reports made on any survey are submitted to Congress, no supplemental or additional report or estimate shall be made unless authorized by law except that the Secretary of the Army may cause a review of any examination or survey to be made and a report thereon submitted to Congress, if such review is required by the national defense or by changed physical or economic conditions: *Provided further*, That the Government shall not be deemed to have entered upon any project for the improvement of any waterway or harbor mentioned in this title until the project for the proposed work shall have been adopted by law:

Watersheds of streams in the North Atlantic region draining northward in New York toward the Saint Lawrence River below the international boundary and draining directly into the Atlantic Ocean above the Virginia-North Carolina State line with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

All streams flowing into the sounds of North Carolina between Cape Lookout and the Virginia line except those portions of the Neuse, Pamlico, and Roanoke Rivers above the estuarine reaches.

Watersheds of streams in the South Atlantic region draining directly to the Atlantic Ocean below the Virginia-North Carolina State line and draining directly into the Gulf of Mexico east of Lake Pontchartrain with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

The Rio Grande River and its tributaries with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas of the great basin region of Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries above Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

The Colorado River and tributaries below Lees Ferry, Arizona, with respect to a framework plan for flood control and other purposes.

Watersheds of streams in the Pacific Northwest region which drains directly into the Pacific Ocean along the coast lines of Washington and Oregon with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Watersheds of streams in California which drain directly into the Pacific Ocean and of streams, washes, lakes and their tributaries, which drain areas in the eastern portion of the California region with respect to a framework plan for developing the water resources of the region.

Kaneohe-Kailua area, Oahu, Hawaii.

Sec. 208. Title II of this Act may be cited as the "Flood Control Act of 1965".

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR FOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENT STUDIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a considerable amount of concern has been

expressed as to the implications for water resource development inherent in the November 20, 1964, directive of the Chief of Engineers regarding criteria to be employed in evaluating new improvements.

Several river valley associations have joined together in expressing views on this subject to the Chief of Engineers. He has responded in detail.

A representative of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Mr. William J. Hull, also represented the Arkansas Basin Development Association, the Inland Empire Waterways Association, Interconnecting Waterways, Inc., the Mississippi Valley Association, and the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Development Authority, in testifying June 10, 1965, before an ad hoc group of the Public Works Committee over which I presided.

In essence, the joint position of the organizations was one of commending the intent of the Chief of Engineers in seeking sound and conservative standards of project evaluation. But the belief was expressed that generally the Corps of Engineers' traffic estimates in project evaluation under previous standards have been fully justified by experience and that there is basis for concern first, lest the newly promulgated standards for traffic estimates result in serious understatement of project potentials; and second, lest these standards introduce an element of subjective conjecture into project evaluation which would obstruct meaningful review of Corps of Engineers reports by the cognizant committees of Congress.

Mr. President, I feel that there is considerable support for the request further stated by the several associations and authorities represented that the Chief of Engineers review the criteria for traffic estimates under the instructions of November 20, 1964, in the light of the conditions cited above and in the light of the emphasis on economic growth and development called for by the "Report on Policies, Standards, and Procedures for Formulating and Evaluating Water Resource Projects," approved by the President in May 1962 and published as Senate Document 97, 87th Congress, 2d session.

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of the best and most informative weekly radio broadcasts in this country is the "Manion Forum," which is produced by Dean Clarence Manion, of South Bend, Ind. Dean Manion was formerly dean of the Law School at Notre Dame University.

In the "Manion Forum" broadcast of April 25, 1965, Miss Marilyn Manion, Dean Manion's very able and dedicated daughter, interviewed Mr. J. G. Sourwine, the distinguished chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The interview was on the subject of Communist espionage and subversion.

Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with this interview and feel that it should be studied by every Member of Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have this radio broad-

cast printed in the Record. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following the text of this broadcast, an important excerpt from Whittaker Chambers' monumental literary work, "Witness." This excerpt was printed with the "Manion Forum" broadcast, and I feel that this excerpt entitled "Why Does Communism Continue To Exist—Even in America?" should likewise be studied by all Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the interview and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMUNIST ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION—EXPERT TESTIMONY REVEALS ITS BREADTH AND DEPTH IN THE U.S.A.

(Interview with J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel, Senate Internal Security Subcommittee)

DEAN MANION. For many years the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate has had a subcommittee for the investigation of the administration of the internal security of the United States—communism, among other things. This subcommittee is composed of nine U.S. Senators, and for many years, as its chief counsel, it has had Mr. J. G. Sourwine. Throughout the years of his service, Mr. Sourwine has acquired a great fund of experience about subversion and subversive activities in the United States.

I take you now to Washington, D.C., where my daughter, Marilyn, is interviewing Mr. J. G. Sourwine, counsel of the Senate subcommittee to investigate the administration of internal security in this country.

MARILYN MANION. Mr. Sourwine, to begin our discussion, I'd like to ask you a very basic question. Since we shall be discussing the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, what is the purpose of the subcommittee? Why does it exist?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Internal Security Subcommittee was created because at the time of passage of the Internal Security Act, Senator McCarran, who was the father of that act, and other Senators thought there should be in the Senate a committee charged with the dual responsibility of legislative oversight of that act and other internal security laws, and charged also with investigating the activities of the Communist Party and other subversive organizations of a totalitarian nature in the United States.

The committee was authorized initially by a resolution of the Senate passed at the end of 1950, and activated in early 1951. The committee has a very specific charter which gives it several responsibilities: those I have mentioned, and the further responsibility of a continuing investigation with respect to propaganda by the Communist Party or any other subversive organization which threatens the internal security of the country. To use the words of our basic resolution, "including but not limited to espionage and subversion."

MARILYN MANION. Is there really a subversive threat to America today; and specifically, is there a strong Communist threat? And is there Communist espionage going on in the United States at the present time?

Mr. SOURWINE. Those are three questions. They are interlocked. The answers are "Yes" in every instance. There is a threat to the internal security of the country just as there is a threat to the internal security of every free country in the world as long as the world Communist conspiracy exists and has as its objective the communization of the world.

The Communist Party is a definite danger to the security because the Communist Party USA is an arm of the world Communist conspiracy, responsible to Moscow, whose tactics and strategy in many instances are directly dictated by Moscow. And because this is a

July 27, 1965

17710

group of hard-core Communists, which means dedicated, disciplined and able.

Now with respect to espionage, we must accept as a fact that there is espionage in the United States, unless we wish to take the position that the Communists are treating the United States, their main enemy, differently from the way they are treating every other country on earth. We have additional evidence with respect to espionage in testimony which has been given back through the years by persons who had been members of the party—parties to the conspiracy, and who have told us what the Communist plan and program is and how they operate.

For instance, several espionage networks have been disclosed. The network which was headed at various times by John Abt and Harold Ware and Nat Witt was one which was exposed. We know that there was another at that time which was not exposed then and has not been exposed since, because we have the sworn testimony that an effort was made to recruit Alger Hiss into the Abt-Ware-Witt group of the party but that the word came through from topside to leave him alone, that he was working with another group.

Now we know that the Communists usually set up their networks in a dual manner. That is, two networks side by side, independent of each other but with the same objectives. When you disclose one and don't find its opposite number, you know that there is one that is still to be uncovered. Also, the Soviet Union has espionage networks operating under three different branches of its government—military, naval and secret police. We have uncovered in this country more than one secret police network. We have uncovered at least one Soviet military espionage network, the Abel network. We have never uncovered a Soviet naval espionage network.

Even in the case of our top level intelligence agencies, there is always a danger of infiltration. The head of the CIA told us some years ago that while he did not know of Communist infiltration in his agency—of course, if he did know about it, he would eliminate it—he operated on the assumption that the agency had been infiltrated. And a more recent instance was that of a defector from a high level position in a Communist country who had himself headed espionage activity who told us that he knew that every agency of our Government had been infiltrated with the exception of the FBI. He didn't know that it had not been infiltrated, but he didn't know that it had been. Is that a sufficient answer?

INFILTRATION BY FEW INFLUENCES MANY

MARILYN MANION. Yes, it is, Mr. Sourwine. You have told us how active the Communists are in the areas of infiltration and espionage. What specifically have they accomplished by this? What goals have they reached?

Mr. SOURWINE. Well, the Communist Party's goals in this country have been many. Many of their goals involve conditioning the people of the country to accept some Communist theory or to act in some way that the Communists want them to act. Perhaps the best way to answer your question would be to give you a single illustration of one Communist operation which has been fully documented by our committee. Would that do?

MARILYN MANION. That certainly would.

Mr. SOURWINE. All right, then, take the case of the Institute of Pacific Relations. This was a non-Communist organization formed in Hawaii, infiltrated and taken over by the Communists while it was still small. They gained control in the 1920's. They built the organization. And they made it eventually the top authoritative organization for scholars and historians in the area of Far Eastern affairs. They published the most authoritative magazine in this area, which was edited by Owen Lattimore, a magazine called Pacific Affairs.

And as a result of this control over a period of 20 years and more, they succeeded in conditioning the thinking of the American people, not only the mass of the people, but the scholars in the field, until nearly everyone in this country was ready and willing to accept a number of false theories about the Far East, including the theory (which thank goodness has now been exploded) that the Chinese Communist movement was just a bunch of agrarian reformers. They did this—the Communists did this—with at no time more than 500 persons involved, of whom at no time were more than 200 party members.

MARILYN MANION. I see that the subcommittee has recently issued a report which describes extensive Communist activities in Latin America, including Communist infiltration among students there. But what about Communist influences on students right here in the United States?

Mr. SOURWINE. The Communists are actively working in that area. A new drive on youth was begun a little over 3 years ago, and between 2 and 3 years ago there was increased emphasis by the party on the campuses as targets.

MARILYN MANION. We hear a lot about academic freedom whenever the American student community is being discussed. And the usual question is: Why shouldn't a Communist be allowed to teach in a school?

Mr. SOURWINE. The reason for this is best explained, I think, by a simile. When a man builds a granary, he builds into the granary every protection he can think of against rats because he knows if the grain is there the rats will try to get in; and if they get in, they'll spoil the grain. He knows this because of the nature of rats with grain. He doesn't have to find a particular rat spoiling a particular grain of wheat in order to need protection for his granary or know that he needs it.

Now every member of the Communist Party has been indoctrinated, has been put under discipline, has been accepted by the party as loyal and reliable, and has accepted as one of his personal obligations to the party the responsibility of using any position he gets for the furtherance of the party's purposes and objectives, on his own initiative where he is not given instructions and in strict accordance with party instructions when he is instructed. A Communist teacher is by definition incapable of exercising academic freedom because he is not permitted by his obligation to the party to teach anything contrary to the party line or to take any action which would help to induce an independent state of mind or a freedom of choice or a capacity for clear thinking in his students. His whole job is to do those things and to teach those things which will help the party obtain its objective of gaining the minds of the students, gaining control over them where possible, advancing its propaganda and making new recruits for the party.

MARILYN MANION. What about Communist speakers being allowed to appear on college campuses?

Mr. SOURWINE. A Communist has the same right of free speech in this country that you or I have. But that right of free speech does not embrace an obligation to make public funds available to the Communists, nor public facilities available to a Communist for the purpose of spreading his message among youth. On the contrary, the fathers and mothers who pay taxes for the education of their children have a right to be assured that their tax money will not be used for the purpose of teaching those children things which are wrong.

COMMUNISTS EXPLOIT NAIVETE OF YOUTH

MARILYN MANION. Approximately how many tax supported schools and colleges have been used in the last few years as platforms for Communist speakers?

Mr. SOURWINE. I can't give you a precise number but I think it's safe to say not less than 200 and probably not more than 400, although I think the total number of appearances by Communists on college campuses may have exceeded 400 substantially.

MARILYN MANION. Why is it that this Communist propaganda among our young people is so effective? Is there any possibility that these students are being conditioned beforehand—made vulnerable for Communist recruitment?

Mr. SOURWINE. I think a categorical answer would be "no," but it would be a misleading answer. A great deal of the Communist purpose in its activity on the campus is to condition the students. And in a sense, students are preconditioned by their youth, by their natural youthful aggressiveness, by their natural youthful idealism, and by their youthful naivete, their lack of sophistication.

The finest mechanical or electronic computer that the mind of man can conceive of will give the wrong answers or break down if false data is fed into it, at least until the computer has been given a sufficient amount of true data to develop within the computer an ability to reject that which is false. The human mind is the finest computer that was ever made. The same thing is true of the human mind, however. If false basic premises are fed into it, and it works properly, false answers will come out.

If false premises are fed into it in contradiction to truth which is already there, at a time when the mind as a computer has not had enough data to achieve enough sophistication to make the choice and reject the false, the result is confusion or even mental breakdown—just as a computer would break down. And it's by reaching for the youth at a time when they are particularly vulnerable that the Communist Party hopes to make major gains through its campaign addressed to college campuses.

MARILYN MANION. Thank you, Mr. Sourwine. As chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, you know of what you speak. And I know that you've enlightened the members of our radio audience in this interview. Ladies and gentlemen, I return you to my father, Dean Manion, in South Bend, Ind.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Marilyn, and thank you, Mr. Sourwine, for this informative and helpful interview about communism and other things.

FREE POSTAGE FOR OUR AMERICAN TROOPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there are several thousand young American boys serving their country in Vietnam. The war seems to be escalating rapidly.

I have visited with some of the returning troops—and have also received mail—which indicates that one thing that would really give them a great deal of encouragement would be for Congress to vote them free postage while in Vietnam.

We can well imagine what happens to these boys when they come out of the jungle mountains, dripping with perspiration, and run down to the canteen to buy a few stamps, which they put in their pockets, which are damp, so that they will have enough stamps to write letters to their loved ones.

It seems to me that this is one thing we should be taking prompt action on. It is not an unusual procedure. It was followed in World War II and in the Korean conflict—and we should do the same thing now.

I have been told that our boys in Vietnam are more concerned about getting free postage than they are in receiving additional financial help. It is little things like this which can give a great boost to their morale. It seems to me that in view of that fact, and because everyone wishes to be helpful, we should do so at once.

A bill is pending before the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service, introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], S. 2315, which would provide this free postage.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], is in the Chamber at the present moment, and I would urge that in the very near future we have a committee meeting and report the bill along this line.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join the Senator from Kansas in urging prompt consideration of this measure. As he has pointed out, we did the same thing for World War II veterans and also for veterans of the Korean conflict. Therefore, if not from the standpoint of finances, from the standpoint of convenience this is certainly something that we can do to help our boys in an area where we know they cannot always have access to postage and find an opportunity to write their friends and loved ones.

I join the Senator from Kansas in expressing the hope that the committee will promptly report the bill, and that the Senate will give it immediate consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. I, too, wish to join the distinguished Senator from Kansas and the distinguished Senator from Delaware with respect to the bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON].

This is a timely piece of legislation, one which would be a great morale booster for our troops in Vietnam.

Let me add that it would also be an additional boost to their morale if my bill, Senate 2230, could be voted on, which provides for an increased pay rate for the Armed Forces. It is a duplicate of the Rivers bill in the House of Representatives which is being considered at the present time.

I compliment the Senator from Kansas for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I assure him that I shall work toward its passage, and I am sure that it will be given prompt consideration by the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON] providing for free postage to veterans in Vietnam was referred yesterday to the Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service and will be expedited and brought to the floor of the Senate at the earliest possible moment.

I thank the distinguished ranking Republican Member for his statement in support of the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the comments of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I am confident that, with his support, and that of the other members of the committee, there will be no difficulty in getting action on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I congratulate the Senator on this very important legislation, and also congratulate the chairman of the committee for bringing it to the attention of the Senate.

It is my hope that the bill will be promptly enacted. I am pleased that both sides of the aisle are in complete agreement on it.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 26, 1965, pp. 17527-17536, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the distinguished acting majority leader will yield, there has been colloquy about what his intentions are with respect to action on the conference report tonight.

There are some complications; and I uttered the hope that he would announce to the Senate that any statement any Senator wished to make on the conference report tonight could be made, with the clear and explicit understanding that there would be no vote tonight, and that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow there will be a request for a limitation of time. I shall be glad to join with the acting majority leader in securing a limitation on time insofar as it lies within my power to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader. I will not seek to press this matter to a vote tonight, in view of certain problems which exist with respect to Senators who wish to be heard on the conference report at the time of the vote.

I would hope very much that Senators who are available to discuss this matter would make their speeches before the Senate recesses or adjourns tonight, as the case may be, in view of the fact that there is urgency to this piece of legislation.

In my judgment, the bill should be signed before the end of this month because of effective dates relating to money which many people will need.

The bill contains effective dates for the second month after it is signed. If it is signed this month, it means that some of the benefits will commence in September; if it is signed in August, the benefits will not commence until October.

In my judgment these effective dates should be September, instead of October. I very much hope that we can act on the bill and have it available for the President to sign before the month is over, which means by July 31.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not unaware of the problems of enrolling a bill of this size. Of course it can be done, and extra talent can be employed. However, there is ample opportunity to have it properly enrolled and ready for the President's signature. I shall put no stone in the way of my distinguished friend from Louisiana in attaining his objective. I would be more than glad to cooperate with him in obtaining a time limitation tomorrow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. He always makes his position very clear. He always does a fine job in speaking for all of those on the other side of the aisle, and sometimes even for some of us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I salute him for the fine work he does. I shall work with the Senator to conclude action on the bill as soon as possible. I shall not insist that the Senate vote on the conference report until tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I wonder if the Senator would ask for a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wishes to insist upon a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, I shall seek to accommodate him when the vote occurs tomorrow. Some Senators have indicated that they did not care to have the yeas and nays ordered. Others have indicated that they wished a yea-and-nay vote. My position is very clear for the Record.

Mr. THURMOND. Several Senators would like to have a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There would be no trouble about obtaining a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from South Carolina cares to have the yeas and nays ordered on the adoption of the conference report, I shall be glad to cooperate with him to have that vote. However, I have told some Senators, who have now left the floor, that I knew of no request for the yeas and nays. That being the case, I would prefer to have him make his request tomorrow. At that time I shall be glad to second his motion.

July 27, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. That is satisfactory. I wonder if a quorum call could be had, and in that way have me notified to be on the floor. If it is determined at that time that a ye-a-and-nay vote is desired, I am sure the Senator will cooperate in obtaining such a vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. President, after a full week of consideration your conferees are ready to report that we have reached agreement with the House conferees on the most significant social security and public welfare legislation ever passed by the Congress. Realizing full well the awesome responsibility which was ours we went through the 409-page bill line upon line and section by section to reach agreement on some 513 Senate amendments, including some minor and technical amendments.

The conference bill now before the Senate marks a new era in our effort to promote the general welfare. It recognizes the fact that a dynamic democracy changes as the country grows. It recognizes that we are a great—and questioning—country. It is a reaffirmation, in a time of prosperity, of our concern for our aged and our children which, almost exactly 30 years ago, in a time of deep depression, led to the adoption of our country's first social security system. Building on a great "cornerstone"—as President Franklin D. Roosevelt described the 1935 act—we are proving again today that the American answer to disease and despair is to respond with dedication and with deeds. Much has been demanded of our country in these three decades since 1935, from many parts of the world and from the reaches of outer space. Now, at their close we have recognized that there comes a time—and the time is now with us—when a man must look to his own household and it is in this spirit that the Congress has acted.

We can get some idea of the scope of the 1965 act by comparing it with the historic Social Security Act of 1935. At that time it was estimated that, by 1980, a full 45 years later, social security payments would total \$3½ billion.

If my recollection serves me right, during the first 5 years of the Social Security Act of 1935, no benefits were paid. Under the bill now before us the additional payments alone will greatly exceed this amount in the first full year. And by 1972—8 years earlier than 1980, it is estimated that social insurance payments—including the health and disability features—will be running about \$31 billion a year. I emphasize the fact that these expenditures refer only to trust fund payments for hospital and medical care insurance, and for cash payments to the some 20 million people now entitled to social security benefits and the millions more who will qualify in the future. In addition to these expenditures, the bill includes \$1.3 billion in money from the General Treasury for the first full year. Thus, as finally approved by the conference the social security bill of 1965 contains almost \$6½ billion in additional benefits which extend to every part of our population.

To put these amounts into focus, it is well, perhaps, to measure these payments

to people against the march of our expanding economy. In the year 1950, when social security payments amounted to \$960 million they represented less than one-half of 1 percent of a total personal income for that year which totaled \$228.5 billion. With the improvements in the social security system made by amendments in the 1950's total social security payments had, by 1957 moved up to \$7.4 billion—or about 2 percent of the total personal income for that year of \$351.4 billion. Last year, with total personal income climbing to the unprecedented heights of \$491 billion, total social security payments of \$16.2 billion represented just about 3 percent of our people's total personal income for 1964. Moreover, assuming an increase in personal income in the next 7 years, paralleling that of the last 7 years, these payments in 1972 will equal 5 percent of total personal income. It is then still a relatively small but climbing segment of income. Yet, as we have found through the years the social security segment not only constitutes a growing guarantee that most of us will find a measure of self-sufficiency and dignity in our older years, but these payments—which go directly to purchase the necessities of life—are also an important means of helping to stabilize the economy since they are paid regularly and in fixed amounts.

When I spoke of this bill some days ago as the most significant social security and public welfare legislation ever passed by Congress in the history of our country, I noted an editorial which appeared in the great Washington newspaper, the Washington Post, referring to what I said in this regard as a "modest exaggeration."

I admired the editorial, and I thought it was well taken and well done. However, I would take issue with that great newspaper when it describes my statement as a "modest exaggeration."

What bill ever passed by Congress brought more cash dividends or did more good to more people immediately and even more so within 1 year than this bill? It cannot be said of the Social Security Act of 1935. That act planted good hopes. But then so do the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Not only does this bill plant good hopes, but it nurtures to a flowering maturity the hopes of 1935 and succeeding years. We expand existing benefits and inaugurate great, new benefits.

The new benefits for the first full year of operation under this bill would be \$6.5 billion.

While no one likes to vote for taxes, Congress also has the responsibility to vote the taxes to pay for the benefits provided in the bill. In doing so, we have brought to the Senate in the conference report one of the largest tax bills ever passed to provide medical services for people in this country.

Both as a revenue bill and as a bill providing services, this is a great and significant bill.

It is not "modest exaggeration," it is a fact that this bill does more to meet more human problems than any other measure ever passed.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 which the conferees present to you

today are, then, a reaffirmation in the midsixties of the 20th century of a long heritage of concern, in this country, that our youth and our aged shall have their fair share of the abundance in our land, and shall be protected against the loss of the necessities of life. First, let me discuss a few of the many differences in the bills which were reconciled in conference.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE

The provisions which emerged from the conference committee relating to the basic hospital program represent a reasonable compromise between the House and Senate versions of the bill. As to the number of inpatient hospital days the Senate had provided an unlimited duration to take care of the catastrophic case. As you know, I felt as strongly as any Member of this body as to the desirability of this provision. Needless to say, the House conferees had equally strong convictions as to the wisdom of their legislation, which provided only 60 days of care. The conference agreement provides an additional 30 days of care using the coinsurance provision which was included in the Senate bill. This legislation will take care of about 98 percent of the cases. I think I am safe in saying that we have not heard the last about the unfortunate 2 percent. A complete solution of this problem, however, will have to wait until a future year.

As to the coverage of the physician-specialists under the basic program, the House conferees were insistent that physicians services should be placed in the voluntary supplementary program where the private sector will play a greater role as a buffer between the doctor and the Government.

The Senate prevailed as to the 100 days of extended care—skilled nursing home—but the House version of the home health benefit was taken both as to the requirement of hospitalization and the duration of 100 visits. Some question was raised as to whether there were sufficient facilities to warrant the 175 visits a year and the House believed the home health visits in the voluntary supplementary program afforded sufficient backup protection.

SUPPLEMENTARY PLAN

One of the more significant decisions was the adoption of the House effective date of July 1, 1966, for the supplementary plan. The conferees believed it was important that both the basic program and the supplementary start together and this consideration overrode the administrative convenience of a starting date of January 1, 1967. The Senate inclusion of the services of dentists performing dental surgeon functions was adopted, but the House prevailed in the exclusion of chiropractors and podiatrists.

INCOME TAX PROVISIONS

The conference accepted the Senate amendment eliminating all maximum limitations on the medical expense deduction for all taxpayers.

The House insisted that there be some mechanism for recovering the \$3 monthly premiums for the supplementary plan which are paid from the general funds of the Treasury, from those

the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee had talked with me and with the leadership on this side on the matter of coming in at 11 o'clock and we indicated that that would be perfectly satisfactory, provided that there was a general understanding that since there are only 5 hours of debate on this very important uncontroversial measure, when we on our side would like to have had 6 or 8 hours of general debate, that there would be no effort tomorrow when we get under the 5-minute rule to unduly restrict or limit Members in seeking recognition and speaking under the 5-minute rule. I think that we have a general agreement that a vote would not come until late tomorrow or late in the afternoon, surely sometime around 5 o'clock or so, which would give Members adequate time to seek recognition and to speak under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. HALL. I am constrained to listen to the gentleman because he is a member of the same committee that cut off debate last Thursday evening rather surreptitiously and unexpectedly.

Does the gentleman have more faith in commitments at this time than other minority members of the committee had last Thursday when that legislation was bottled up completely when there were about 11 amendments, all of which I listed, which were considered in less than 15 minutes and not one word was said in explanation of any one other than the reading after the debate had been cut off by a motion on the majority side?

Certainly the gentleman would agree with me that no one can say that we have "bob-tailed" debate, as we would say down on the Ozarks, here tonight.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the gentleman's concern and I am glad he is concerned. I wait the gentleman to be satisfied before he withdraws his reservation, if he sees fit to do so, that there will be adequate time tomorrow. I hope the leadership on the majority side will be able to convince the gentleman that that is the procedure to be expected.

I would like to ask the majority leader a question, and yield to him for an answer to this question: How much time he estimates it will take to decide these various bills that are listed here for Wednesday and the balance of the week, some of which, of course, have 2 hours of debate under an open rule, as listed, but I would imagine, based on my experience in the House, they will whiz through like sauce through a widow woman.

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot say how much time it will take to dispose of the legislative program.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know of any additional conference reports to come up other than the ones we expected through the House today?

Mr. ALBERT. There may be conference reports. I intended to announce other legislative business. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has advised he might call up by unanimous consent two bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. There will be additional business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained not to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

CRUISE LEGISLATION

(Mr. MAILLIARD (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, last year nearly one-half million U.S. citizens departed from the shores of this country on ocean cruises. Nine out of every ten boarded foreign-flag cruise ships, which received over \$150 million in revenue from our traveling public.

I cite these figures to indicate the substantial amount of American passengers and dollars involved in the lucrative cruise business and, more importantly, to emphasize that this profitable market has attracted foreign-flag vessels to the point of predominance. I am not opposed to foreign-flag cruise operations, but our Government presently lacks the authority to demand that these vessels comply with our high safety standards and maintain adequate financial responsibility. As a result, thousands of our citizens have either unsuspectingly jeopardized their lives aboard substandard foreign-flag ships, or suffered financial loss when voyages were cancelled by irresponsible cruise operators.

Realizing this dilemma, I introduced a bill last January which will require foreign-flag vessels engaged in cruises from U.S. ports to be licensed by the Secretary of Commerce. It established guidelines under which the Secretary would be authorized to license foreign-flag operators who conform to American standards of safety and demonstrate financial responsibility.

Since then, I have invited comments from representatives of our maritime industry on how this legislation might be clarified and improved. With the benefit of their suggestions, I am now introducing a revised version which includes two specific changes: first, the licensing authority is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to consultation with the Secretary of Commerce; and second, the new version more clearly indicates the area involved in U.S. coastwise cruise traffic which would be subject to this bill.

I must emphasize that my intention is not to prohibit foreign-flag cruise operations from American ports, but rather to provide protection for the lives and earnings of our citizens who sail on these vessels. I do not deny that there are many responsible foreign-flag liners in the trade. My bill is not directed to them. On the contrary, I seek their support for this measure which would preserve the reputation of those seaworthy foreign-flag vessels which qualify for licenses under my bill.

There are other reasons which merit the passage of this legislation: Last week the Department of Defense announced to American shipowners that it would employ over three dozen ships, including I understand troopships for military operations in Vietnam—the most recent

example of our reliance upon adequate and efficient passenger transports for potential defense purposes. During the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, privately owned passenger ships of the merchant marine were placed on standby alert by the Defense Department. Yet with the demonstrated need for a modern and substantial passenger fleet, our flag ships have declined to number to 13 with no program of replacement, let alone expansion, envisaged.

To help solve this problem, my bill would permit more U.S. cruise business for U.S. ships and since over 20 percent of our total foreign passenger traffic consists of cruise business, it can substantially assist our ailing passenger liner trade.

It is ironic that with our continuing concern over our international balance of payments and the drain on U.S. gold reserves, American passengers spend each year over \$170 million for travel, almost 90 percent of which goes to foreign-flag operators. Unless remedial action is taken now, I can only visualize a greater drain on our reserves as an increasing number of foreign-flag vessels engage in our burgeoning cruise traffic.

With more money and leisure time available, an estimated one-half million Americans will embark this year on cruise ships—most of which are foreign owned. My first concern is for their safety, which makes passage of my bill of paramount importance. But I am also concerned with the security of those who stay ashore, of all Americans who depend upon the adequacy of our defense programs, and more specifically upon the maintenance of a modern and sufficient passenger fleet for potential military operations; nor is the future of our passenger liner operators and the men they employ of any less importance to me.

I realize that my bill will not guarantee the safety of each and every American passenger, nor will it eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit, nor is this bill a panacea to revitalize this Nation's passenger fleet. It is, however, a significant step toward achieving these objectives. I urge your support of this legislation.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE WAR

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, recent editorial opinion around the country has questioned the lack of public debate, and especially the lack of congressional action, in the growing American involvement in the war in Vietnam. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch asked, editorially:

How can the President take America step by step into a major Asian land war without action by Congress? Does not the Constitution give Congress, rather than the President, the power to declare war? What can the plain citizen do about it?

The Post-Dispatch goes on to suggest that, among things, concerned citizens can write to their Senators and Representatives. But does this really answer

July 27, 1965

the question? I think not. The Congress has not yet developed the procedures and mechanism to deal with the type of limited or unconventional war situations that we had in Korea in the 1950's and that we have today in southeast Asia. We still think of war in a 19th century frame of mind.

I firmly believe in the vitality of our Constitution and of our basic congressional structure. Yet I am concerned that we have not updated the power of Congress to declare war to the needs of the latter half of the 20th century. I am concerned that Congress has not taken the leadership in a full and constructive public debate of our objectives in Vietnam and southeast Asia and in the appropriateness of our policies to the basic economic and political, as well as military, requirements for stability in the area. Unless Congress does discuss these issues, how can the American people begin to understand the nature of our commitment? This, in my view, was one of the major reasons for giving Congress such powers—to assure popular review and understanding of the steps that would commit us to war.

It is my hope that scholars of Congress and the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress will study this question as we seek to make the Congress a more vital institution.

Let me call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony of Congressman DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois, before the joint committee, which dealt in part with this question. I also call to your attention recent editorial comment from the New York Times and the St. Louis Post Dispatch:

CONGRESS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Excerpts from statement before the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, by Representative DONALD RUMSFELD, 13th Congressional District, Illinois)

Mr. Chairman, in the mid-1800's, Alexis de Tocqueville said: "We have seen that the Federal Constitution entrusts the permanent direction of the external interests of the Nation to the President and the Senate, which tends in some degree to detach the general foreign policy of the Union from the direct control of the people. It cannot therefore be asserted with truth that the foreign affairs of the state are conducted by the democracy."

This quotation and events of recent years raise the question as to whether the balance in our system of government would be more perfect if the Congress as a whole, and particularly the House of Representatives, had a larger legislative role in the area of foreign policy. Areas for possible consideration in this connection include:

1. The proposal to amend the Constitution to give the House of Representatives, along with the Senate, authority to ratify treaties. This problem was brought to mind with the recent consideration of the International Coffee Agreement which came about as a result of the treaty which had never been considered by the House of Representatives, and yet House action was required to enact the implementing legislation to fulfill U.S. treaty obligations.

2. The proposal to strengthen the role of Congress in the field of national security and foreign policy by the creation of a permanent Joint Committee for National Security with authority to make findings and recommendations to the appropriate legislative committees.

Finally, I am of the opinion that it might be appropriate at this point in history for a study of the nature of the constitutional authority granted the Congress with respect to foreign and military affairs. For example, at the time the Constitution was drafted, the meaning of the word "war" was reasonably well understood. The U.S. position with respect to World War I and World War II was clear. However, more recently, and particularly in Korea, Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the United States has pursued military actions which by any reasonable definition constitute warfare. These actions were at the direction of the President and without any official declaration of war by the Congress.

Our Constitution created separate branches of Federal Government and attempted to establish checks and balances between these branches. Undoubtedly, the Congress was given the power to declare war for a reason. Today the United States is engaged in an undeclared war in Vietnam. This, I believe, raises a number of questions:

Does the concept of declaring of war need updating?

What was the original constitutional intent?

Should Congress hold additional hearings on such matters, or merely let the "teach-ins" serve as a platform for debate on foreign policy?

If hearings should be held, which committees should be involved?

What is Congress proper role today in these areas of foreign policy and undeclared war, in view of the advent of nuclear weaponry and the modern technology of warfare and the need for centralized control and decisionmaking?

Is the normal authorization and appropriation process sufficient and/or is it being utilized adequately, to fill the desirable congressional role in this area?

Is Congress effectively exercising its power of appropriation to involve sufficiently the representative branch of the Federal Government in the basic issues underlying our foreign commitments—and a declaration of war is only one point on the spectrum in this regard?

Is the congressional check on executive action in the increasingly important area of intelligence, counterinsurgency, and covert military operations adequate?

With the improbability of wars on the scale of 19th and early 20th century conflicts and the increasing likelihood of so-called cold war wars, and the resulting use of programs of counterinsurgency, do we need to define the various war situations that we are likely to face and evaluate the desirable congressional role—which might vary considerably—in each?

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the world is constantly changing. Even meanings of words are continuously changing. I do not pretend to know the answers to the questions I have raised. Nor do I make any specific observations or recommendations with respect to current U.S. foreign policy. Rather, I am raising these questions in the sincere hope that your committee will consider, and hopefully shed some light on this question of Congress and its role in the foreign and military activities of the Federal Government—a matter I believe to be of great significance to the Nation and our system of Government.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, June 10, 1965]

THE PEOPLE CAN BE HEARD

An anguished voice on the telephone posed questions often heard: How can the President take America step by step into a major Asian land war without action by Congress? Doesn't the Constitution give Congress,

rather than the President, the power to declare war? What can the plain citizen do about it?

The Constitution does, of course, reserve formal warring power to Congress, but it also grants the President authority to conduct foreign policy and it makes him Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. Especially in modern times, he thus has power to create a war situation, whether Congress "declares" war or not.

The real question is not a constitutional one. Granting that the President has authority to do what he is doing, plain citizens can still oppose it, and demand an alternative policy. If they will make their opposition to escalation of the war overwhelming, and unremitting, they can create a body of public opinion not to be ignored by any President.

Too many citizens who are distressed by involvement in an immoral and unjustifiable war feel helpless. They are not helpless. By writing to the President, writing to Senators and Representatives, talking to their friends, supporting antiwar organizations like the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (which sponsored the huge New York rally Tuesday night)—in short, by using all forms of expression open to a free people, they can be heard.

The latest Gallup poll shows that at least 54 percent of the people oppose the Vietnam war in one degree or another. That is why the White House backed away so sharply from the State Department's disclosure this week that American troops have been given a new role of active combat at the discretion of local commanders. Public opinion proved not "ready" for that disclosure, and so it was glossed over with ambiguities. Yet we can be sure that this phase of escalation will be undertaken, and others as well, unless public opinion against them becomes irresistible.

Sincere Americans support the President's policy. We think they are tragically mistaken.

Many fear the threat of a totalitarian, implacably hostile Red China; and nobody need have any illusions about the dangers of the aggressive ideology for which China's present rulers stand. It does not follow that American involvement in a Vietnamese jungle war best serves our national interests as against China. We are in fact serving China's interest instead.

We are dissipating our military resources in a peripheral conflict while China conserves hers intact. We are waging a white man's war against Asian victims of colonialism, and thereby making allies for Red China throughout the ex-colonial world. We are disrupting the West's hopeful reconciliation with Russia, driving Moscow into an unwanted partnership with Peiping. What more could China ask?

Sincere Americans feel that, right or wrong, the Vietnamese commitment has been made and must be carried out to the end. This is to say that once on a wrong road you must stay on it even if it leads you over the brink—a rule no sensible person would impose on himself.

Some feel we would lose prestige, or "face," by adopting a new policy. France fought the Vietnamese people for 10 years and gave it up as hopeless; France's prestige in southeast Asia today is far greater than ours. De Gaulle liquidated the war in Algeria over protests from French patriots, and France is a stronger power than she was when fighting the Algerians. In today's world, nobody loses face by making honorable peace.

Some feel that unless we stamp out communism in Vietnam all Asia will fall like dominoes to China. Stamping out any idea, however, is beyond the power of guns and bombs. The future of Asia will be determined not by any automatic signal but by the history, economic condition, social progress, and traditions of each individual

July 27, 1965

17785

country. In Asia, as in Europe, national identities, cultures, and interests erect the most effective barrier to external conquest, no matter what ideological development each nation follows.

Some feel that expanded war is unavoidable since the North Vietnamese have rejected Mr. Johnson's offer of peace talks. The plain citizen can test that proposition by consulting his own experience. If he wanted to induce an enemy to negotiate, would he expect to succeed by clubbing the enemy over the head? Can a warring nation expect to obtain negotiations by refusing to deal with the forces actually fighting on the other side?

There is an alternative to the present policy in Vietnam, and public opinion can insist upon it. Without surrender, without craven retreat, without abrupt withdrawal, the United States can take its stand on President Johnson's statement of March 25 that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the (Geneva) agreements of 1954."

It can say, as the President did on May 13: "We know, as our adversaries also should know, that there is no purely military solution in sight for either side."

It can propose, therefore, that the international conference which arrived at the Geneva agreements of 1954 be reconvened, and that a subcommittee composed of nations not involved in the Vietnamese fighting be appointed to draft a peaceful settlement that will carry out the essentials of those 1954 agreements.

It can announce that we are ready for an immediate cease-fire and a military and political standstill during such talks. It can affirm our willingness to accept an honorable settlement which guarantees, as the 1954 pact sought to do, military neutralization, self-determination, and the end of all foreign intervention for North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

If the plain American citizen wants that kind of policy in southeast Asia, rather than a steadily escalating war, he will have to let his Government know it in unmistakable terms.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1965]

WAR WITHOUT CONSENT?

The steady buildup of American combat troops in South Vietnam raises questions that deserve forthright answers. Only a month ago reports of a projected buildup in ground forces were officially denied in Washington. Since those denials, there has been a 50-percent increase in American military personnel in Vietnam.

In the past 10 weeks, while the administration has reported continuity of policy, American troops in Vietnam have been doubled to more than 46,500. Indications that the total will rise above 60,000 this summer have been accompanied by reports that the objective is a force exceeding 100,000, including 3 full Army and Marine combat divisions.

What is involved is not simply an increase in personnel but an apparent change in the fundamental character of the American involvement. What began as American aid in a Vietnamese war is in danger of becoming an American war against Asians, with the South Vietnamese relegated to a subsidiary role.

Whether this shift would be wise can be debated. But what can hardly be debated is that such an evolution would represent a complete break with the policy enunciated by President Kennedy when, in September 1963, he said:

"In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win it or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as ad-

visers, but they have to win it, the people of Vietnam, against the Communists."

Coming after futile months of bombing North Vietnam, the current build-up seems to recognize that the war cannot be won in the North, but could be lost in the South. Ironically, it was the bombing of the North that set off the build-up, for initially its aim was simply to protect Danang, the key airbase for the attacks against the North. In this manner, one furious upward whirl on the escalation spiral has led into another. Only yesterday it was announced that American destroyers have been shelling the Vietnamese coast.

Marine and paratroop battalions now have been landed in five areas, ostensibly to protect airbases and the ports that supply them. But some of these units have begun to move out of their role of passive defense into exercises beyond their air base perimeters.

There are reports that aggressive patrolling is beginning and that this will give way to the more extensive kind of clear and hold counterinsurgency operations hitherto carried out only by South Vietnamese forces. The hazards go beyond the obvious. Even those military officers in Washington who believe the Communists can be defeated with the aid of a large buildup reportedly recognize the difficulty American troops have in distinguishing the enemy who fades into the civilian population.

Earlier this month Mr. Johnson said that the war in Vietnam had "no purely military solution in sight for either side." He indicated that his aim was to maintain the present stalemate until the Communists agreed to a negotiated settlement.

If this aim is being abandoned, if the country is being taken gradually and almost surreptitiously into a large-scale land war on the continent of Asia, the time has come for the Nation to be told what is happening—and why.

CONCENTRATIONS OF POWER AND THE NATIONAL INTEREST

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the economic well-being of our country is threatened when centralization and concentration of power, capable of paralyzing whole industries, are permitted which can flaunt the public interest without fear of legal culpability. Just as business concentrations of power were found to require certain legislative controls over their activities, so today should it be recognized that labor monopolies have long passed the point at which legislative action should have been initiated. Industrywide bargaining in the trucking and the railroad industries are examples of the concentration of power by labor monopolies. The result of these industrywide negotiations lead to industrywide strikes and lockouts which paralyze the entire Nation.

Contributing to the problem is the fact that the Congress has failed to deal with the individual problems as they arise because of a splitting of authority in the Houses of Congress. The House Committee on Education and Labor, the seemingly obvious body to deal with this problem of power concentration shares its jurisdiction with the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the In-

terstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Judiciary Committee. Each of these committees deals with problems in its own peculiar province and a comprehensive approach is lacking. The same sort of fragmentation occurs in the other body. With the increasingly interrelated nature of our economy, this lack of capacity on the part of the Congress to deal with these problems, should be rectified.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing a proposal which calls for the establishment of a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts. This committee would consist of eight Members of each House of the Congress with the membership split equally between the majority and minority parties.

I have advocated that such a committee be established with the sincere hope that this would provide an atmosphere for intensive study of these problems that would be free from the intense pressure of special interest groups and partisan politics. This committee would have power to recommend legislation after its studies that would reflect reasoned and deliberate congressional thinking on the matter.

Too often in the past have solutions of expediency been made in national crises because of the aura of emergency surrounding a dispute calling for reasoned consideration. The long-range effects of such solutions are barely touched upon in such situations.

I believe that the measure which I am introducing today offers excellent prospects for taking into account the needs of all parties involved—management, labor, and the public—and developing a mechanism whereby the Congress could, in the future, deal effectively and comprehensively with these situations before they reach the stage when the danger to the Nation from inaction or unhurried action is acute.

POOR MAIL SERVICE IN SOUTH DAKOTA

(Mr. BERRY (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention my views on the poor mail service in the State of South Dakota.

I have received hundreds of protests from all over the State of South Dakota concerning this problem, from people of all walks of life and all types of businesses. The postal department must perfect their new system at once or go back to the old plan.

The harder the Post Office Department tries to improve service, the more erratic the service becomes. Each change seems to be more confusing and less desirable.

The day-to-day problems created by the present mail service are no joke. It is now time for the Post Office Depart-

17786

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 27, 1965

ment to take a good look at its mail service in South Dakota.

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

(Mr. TALCOTT (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Visitors to the USAF Academy, pursuant to Public Law, title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), and the following, visited the Academy during May 6-8, 1965, and on July 8, 1965, duly filed its report with the President. This year, for the first time, three congressional members of the Board filed additional views in conjunction with the report. This seems to have caused special interest and a demand for the report which has not yet been made available to Members of Congress or the public. To avoid speculation about, and misrepresentation of, the report before it is finally made available to the public, under unanimous consent, I include the report, verbatim and in total, at this place in the Record:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

1. APPOINTMENT TO THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy was appointed under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD Appointed by the President

Three years effective 1963: Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF (retired), former Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.; Mr. John Lawrence, chairman of the board and president, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Three years effective 1964: Mr. Harold Cutilf Stuart, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Tulsa, Okla.; second appointment not made before Board convened.

Three years effective 1965: Appointments not made before Board convened.

Appointed by the Vice President

Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Colorado; Senator DANIEL B. BREWSTER, Maryland; Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Texas.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House

Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., 6th District, Georgia; Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, 7th District, Wisconsin; Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, 1st District, Colorado; Representative BURT L. TALCOTT, 12th District, California.

Ex-officio members

Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee: Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; designee: Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri.

Chairman, House Armed Services Committee: Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, 1st District, South Carolina; designee: Representative MELVIN PRICE, 24th District, Illinois.

3. CONVENING OF THE BOARD

The Board convened at 8:30, May 6, 1965, and elected Representative BYRON G. ROGERS as its chairman. The Board completed its meetings at 12:30 on May 8, 1965.

Those present were: Gen. Thomas D. White, USAF (retired); Mr. John Lawrence; Mr. Harold Cutilf Stuart; Senator GORDON

ALLOTT; Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.; Representative BYRON G. ROGERS; and Representative BURT L. TALCOTT.

4. COMMENTS OF THE BOARD Procedural considerations

The Board is cognizant of the provisions of section (e) of 10 U.S.C. 9355 which reads as follows:

"(e) The Board shall inquire into the morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy which the Board decides to consider."

In order to make the Board visitations and future reports of more value and significance, it recommends for future guidance.

1. That the leadership of the House of Representatives and the Senate assume responsibility for the appointments to the Board membership in the first month of each calendar year.

2. That the President be informed of the importance of early selection of the Presidential appointees to the Board, which also should be announced by February 1.

3. That the senior congressional appointees of each House of Congress arrange jointly for preliminary meeting of the Board in Washington, D.C., to determine:

(a) Time of the annual visitation.
(b) Particular items for special study during the annual visitation.
(c) Proposed agenda for the annual visitation.

(d) Requirements for assistance to the Board in support of preliminary studies and during the visits of the Board.

4. That the Board when convened at the Academy should:

(a) In addition to participating in group sessions, pursue such independent inquiries as the individual members desire, including private conferences with individuals or groups of cadets, faculty and staff members.
(b) Determine if more than one visit, as authorized by sections (d) and (f), 10 U.S.C. 9355, is advisable.

Fulfillment of Academy mission

Despite the cheating incident which involved a small percentage of cadets and despite the always present room for improvement, the Board of Visitors considers the U.S. Air Force Academy to be an outstanding national asset successfully fulfilling its stated mission which is, "To provide instruction, experience, and motivation to each cadet so that he will graduate with the knowledge, character, and qualities of leadership essential to his progressive development as a career officer in the U.S. Air Force."

Academy expansion

The Board noted the orderly progress in the expansion of the Academy which was authorized by Public Law 88-276. The planned expansion of facilities was endorsed. The Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for the first increment of additional cadet quarters and an adjacent formation area, minor alteration of the dining hall and a portion of the required utilities. Additional facilities programed in fiscal year 1966 include an addition to the academic building, a fieldhouse and a small addition to the gymnasium; in fiscal year 1967, the second increment of cadet quarters, an addition to the dining hall, finishing of additional athletic fields, and a second increment of utilities, and in fiscal year 1968, a formation area adjacent to the new cadet quarters, alteration of the cadet social center, an addition to the medical facility and paving of parking areas. The Board recognizes that the construction of facilities has been programed to match a phased increase in the size of the cadet wing to reach the full authorized strength of 4,417 late in fiscal year 1971, and recommends the authorization and appropriation of funds as required to meet the stated program.

It is apparent from visual examination that there have been excessive repair costs on comparatively new construction and that defects in construction could have been prevented by close inspection during construction and before acceptance. In the forthcoming expansion program, as it specifically is related to new construction, the Board recommends that the engineers and architects be instructed to prevent the acceptance of substandard construction.

If and when a program for construction of additional family housing for staff personnel is undertaken, it is recommended that more adequate ground space per unit be provided than was provided at the time of the construction of family housing in the Douglass Valley and Pine Valley areas. It is further recommended that such construction generally be in conformity with generally accepted modern building codes and zoning practices.

Morale and discipline

On the day that the Board assembled, the Secretary of the Air Force made public the report of a special advisory committee which dealt extensively with these subjects. Therefore, and in view of time and other limitations imposed upon it, the Board of Visitors does not comment on these specific aspects of that report. However, the Board commends the members of the special committee for their thorough investigation and constructive suggestions concerning this subject, and commends the Secretary of the Air Force for his promptness both in appointing the committee and in making public its findings.

The curriculum

The Board continues to be favorably impressed by the extraordinary academic accomplishments of the Air Force Academy during its relatively short history. When all available objective criteria are considered, the Academy compares favorably with the best colleges and universities in the United States. Credit for such a superior record must be shared by the cadet wing, the faculty, and the staff. That the young men of our country are well aware of these accomplishments is indicated by the expression of college preference from those students identified as being the most able among National Merit Scholarship competitors. The merit semifinalists and recipients of letters of commendation as identified during 1961, 1962, and 1963 (the top 2 or 3 percent of high school juniors in academic ability), ranked the Academy 25th among the colleges most preferred as first and second choices. All of the more preferred colleges were founded at least 65 years previously, in contrast with the 1955 founding of the Air Force Academy.

The Board commends the Academy for introducing as innovations in service academy curriculums the enrichment and academic majors programs which challenge the cadets to progress profitably as far and as fast as they can in academic areas best suited to their capabilities and interest. The Board believes that cadets who are qualified should be encouraged to participate; however, no pressure, direct or indirect, should be permitted upon cadets to take overload courses in order to gain competitive advantage.

Equally impressive to the Board is the Academy's physical education program which clearly reflects concerted efforts to accomplish the Academy's assigned mission. The program includes instruction, intramural participation and varsity competition. All of these are oriented toward the development of leadership, positive attitudes toward competition and physical fitness, active and continuous body conditioning, and strong interest in carryover individual sports. Instruction is provided in 17 different aspects of physical education which include combatives, swimming and water survival,

July 27, 1965

to host and conduct tours, then I suggest the assignment of an additional general officer to the Academy for that purpose and let the Superintendent perform his executive responsibilities.

Pentagon officials, both civilian and uniformed, should leave administrative details and press releases alone and let matters of that kind be handled by administrative officials of the Academy. If this policy had been followed, the image of the Air Force Academy would not have been trashed as it was during January 1965, through no fault of Academy officials or Air Force Academy cadets.

4. While I subscribe generally to the recommendations of the White Committee Report, I believe that the timing of its release on the date of the convening of the 1965 meeting of the Board of Visitors was a serious error in judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

(Mr. COLLIER (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. COLLIER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

GIVEAWAY BUNGLING

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, when are we going to wake up and realize that we are being taken for a ride? The United Arab Republic is doing a neat job of making a fool out of the United States.

Less than a month ago, Egypt's Nasser took full advantage of the U.S. willingness to hand out free wheat. Now we find out that we gave them over \$23 million worth of corn in 1961 on the basis of an out-and-out misrepresentation.

It was a General Accounting Office report to Congress that disclosed that a shipment of 186,000 metric tons of corn to the United Arab Republic under the auspices of the Agency for International Development was obtained under false pretenses. The grant was made on the basis of reports from the Communist-sympathizing country of a potential famine because of a serious crop failure. It was later disclosed that no crop failure occurred and much of the corn had been sold by the United Arab Republic.

Our giveaway bungling really showed up this time. AID officials found out the United Arab Republic was selling some of the corn even before the whole grant was shipped. With over \$11 million worth still in the hands of the U.S. officials, AID apparently made no attempt to hold the shipments until the matter could be investigated.

The GAO report charged that the Agency for International Development did not check on distribution of over 85 percent of the corn. It has been substantiated that at least 80,000 tons have been sold by the United Arab Republic Government.

This report only serves to emphasize what I have been saying all along. We are willing to spend taxpayers' dollars to give aid to anyone who stretches out their hand. Only last month, I pointed out the fallacy of our \$37 million food gift to the United Arab Republic.

I want to commend the General Accounting Office on their alertness. I hope their report opens some eyes in Washington. If it does not, it seems we will continue to help a country that openly degrades the United States and is critical of our policy.

Perhaps what is needed is action by Congress demanding that any future grants be made only when it is assured that all the aid goes for the purpose that it was intended to. Apparently, the agencies are not able to do so on their own.

VIETNAM CRISIS

(Mr. REINECKE (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation and the entire free world are approaching a crisis of major proportions. It is known that the President is concerned about the Vietnam crisis heightened only last Friday by the use of surface-to-air missiles against our airplanes. The missile charges have not been denied and must therefore be true. So now we see that our unnecessary delays, excuses, changing of U.S. military administrators, and behind the scenes changing of South Vietnam heads of state have cost us that vital ingredient of military strategy—the initiative.

These missiles are not of North Vietnam manufacture. They must be Chinese or Russian—and I am told that they are undoubtedly Russian missiles—manned and fired by Russian technicians.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican has, for some time, supported the President in his general policies of a firm military posture, but are we to continue tinkering with ground troops in an air war? Are we to continue our limited air offensive knocking out trees, swamps, footbridges, and isolated vehicles on highways? When, Mr. Speaker, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. President, are we going to face the facts? When are we going to declare war on all military targets? When are we going to start fighting to win? How many more American boys must die in a war of undefined objectives? Is it perhaps a problem of logistics? Have we relied too much on civilian advisers and not heeded the warnings of the military people? Do we have enough war materiel in Vietnam to do the job? How about our air strength; do we have sufficient planes of the required type? When, Mr. Speaker, will we be asked to take planes away from our Air National Guard because of our experts deciding that manned aircraft is no longer necessary?

Mr. Speaker, it is time we face the facts, it is time we debate these issues and, above all, Mr. Speaker, let us re-

member that the Constitution clearly states that it is the power of Congress—not the Secretary of Defense—to declare war.

(Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MOORE'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. MORTON'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION THIS WEEK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS], has advised that he will call up some time during the remainder of the week two bills unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means: H.R. 7502, income tax treatment of casualty losses attributable to major disasters, and H.R. 6431, suspension of duty on certain forms (1 nickel).

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. PIRNIE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TRADING STAMPS AND THE RISING COST OF FOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Wednesday I posed a series of questions in this Chamber about the possible interconnections between rising food prices and the widespread use of trading stamps. I did this because this House, the last line of defense for the American consumer, must understand all of the parameters that affect retail food prices. And because we certainly can not overlook one that is connected to \$38 billion in retail sales a year—the \$38 billion figure is ours, arrived at by multiplying the \$950 million stamp companies make by the appropriate numbers so that 950 million equals 2.5 percent of sales; \$950 million from the book "The Inside Facts About Trading Stamps," by Calvin Train, page 3. Book given you by FTC and says so on first page—certainly

July 27, 1965

17790

not one that affects at least 43 percent of all the food sold in the United States—from "Changing Times" for April 1962, "Why Don't They Just Cut the Price," page 9.

I posed these questions in good faith—because I just did not know the answers and felt that we as legislators should. I further suggested that I would be holding informal meetings between Members of Congress, representatives of the food retailing business, and the trading stamp companies. The first of those meetings was held yesterday morning between six Members of Congress and representatives of the food industry. The men who participated in that meeting are to be commended for their public spirit and congratulated for their dedication to the American principle of free and open inquiry in a free society. These men gave up their time, came to Washington at their own expense, and presented us with a very learned and erudite discussion of the trading stamp business as seen from their end. I am also grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. RACE], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GERTYS] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who took the time out of a busy schedule in an especially busy week to exemplify once again their concern for the American consumer.

The second of these meetings was to be held this morning between Members of Congress and representatives of the stamp companies. It was not held. It was not held because a veil of silence, a "stamp curtain," was dropped over the affairs of the stamp companies. Perhaps the most dangerous, and certainly the most damning action possible in an open society occurred—the companies unanimously refused to lower themselves to talk to Members of Congress about the welfare of the American consumer.

They told us they could not "justify the additional expense of time, manpower, and money" to come to Washington and participate—you have the letter. No; they could not afford to participate today, but they could afford to have three people in the audience yesterday just listening. They could not afford to help us solve a problem, but they could afford to send their legal counsel, the head of their research department and other men into my office to try and dissuade me from even giving a speech on the floor of the House. Those same men at an open meeting, discussing with Congressmen the problems of the American housewife, would have been more than sufficient. But they preferred to use them as lobbyists. It is a sorry description of a billion dollar industry; a terrifying exhibit of morality and bad taste.

I wanted a meeting where we could sit around, be informed and our questions answered in a congenial and friendly atmosphere—by their actions, the trading stamp companies are telling us they will only answer to an investigation.

As a direct result of these actions, I am calling for a meeting of representatives of the Federal Trade Commission,

the National Food Marketing Commission, the Commerce Department, the Office of the President's Adviser on Consumer's Affairs, the Agriculture Department, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Labor, and other interested Government agencies—to ask each of them to investigate this problem within the confines of their statutory authority, preparatory to having my staff turn over all of the information we have acquired, as well as these reports, to the Consumer Affairs Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. An investigation must be held. We must begin at once.

Now, are not all the answers readily available? Are we merely resurrecting a dead horse in asking these questions? I maintain the answer is "No." The last time the FTC made any authoritative statement on trading stamps was 1957—8 years ago; the last time any authoritative government study of the connection between prices and trading stamps was published was 1958—"Trading Stamps and Their Impact on Food Prices," U.S. Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research Division, Department of Agriculture, you have copy—and that study covered the years 1955-57. There was a rash of interest in trading stamps and food prices—but it was while stamps were just beginning to enter the picture; while the effect of stamps was to divert customers away from nonstamp stores and thereby increase volume at a particular store enough to be self-liquidating. But that required an increase in volume of from 10 to 25 percent and with stamps almost everywhere—from various estimates—this includes about 90 percent of the estimates—it is impossible to increase food consumption everywhere by that much. Who is paying for stamps now?

As recently as April 1964, the Legislative Research Council of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts wanted to find out—you have with you, page 4. But in frustration it had to admit, "Many of the best reports on the price impact of stamps are now outdated in light of the vast growth of stamps in the past 3 years alone. Most of these reports were made prior to current saturation in the key food marketing industry." And this report is overall a prostamp publication.

Since 1964, little has been published on stamps that is convincing either way. Such reports as were published have been the result of emotionalism or special interest. The only exception being an article in the April 1965 issue of the Monthly Labor Review that attempted statistically to discuss whether the Consumer Price Index was affected over a 15-year period by the use of trading stamps. But we are not interested in a 15-year period—we are interested in the time since stamp saturation; and we are not today interested in the Consumer Price Index—but in food prices—which make up considerably less than one-third of that figure. Stretched out over a 15-year period and including myriads of other items than food, a 2-percent increase in the price of food due to stamps would appear statistically insignificant—but that is not what we are

asking and that answer, though it has been insistently flaunted by the stamp companies as answering our questions, is basically a nonsequitur. In short, we are breaking new ground today—the questions we are asking are valid; the Government does not know the answers and it should.

That article, however, in parenthetic remarks, did raise some significant points, and since it is the most current Government publication on the subject, I will belabor it for just a moment more. It stated that as recently as July 1963, trading stamps were already used in 65 percent of all chainstores and super-markets—see first reference at the beginning of my remarks. It remarked that a Bureau of Labor Statistics Survey in 1956 indicated that only half of the grocers surveyed felt that stamps increased sales enough to cover their costs. In another survey only 10 percent of 304 grocers felt that stamp costs were being covered by increased volume. And this was when the number of stamps distributed annually was considerably less than half what it is today. If increased volume does not cover the cost of stamps—and the article states as much for the present situation:

It is reasonable to argue (the article states) that greater sales advantages accrue in the initial stages of stamp programs, but when an area is nearly saturated with stamps, retailers may not be able to secure the additional sales volume required to offset their costs.

Now, if food stores operate with a one-half to 2 percent margin on sales, and stamps cost 2 to 3 percent of sales—and it cannot cover the cost of stamps through increased volume—who does pay for stamps and how?

The meetings yesterday went a long way toward beginning to find an answer to that question. A representative of the second largest food chain in the United States unequivocally that the cost of stamps are reflected in higher food prices—man from Safeway. Where his chain has discontinued using stamps he has been enabled to cut food prices for the consumer. Apparently the stamp companies do not want to contest this statement; they were there in enough strength to know it was made.

Further research has brought out the following salient information: Though the stamp companies pay taxes on the basis of 95 percent redemption, the actual figures of a projection by the largest stamp company appears to be closer to 90 percent, which means—S. & H. figures you have—if true, almost \$50 million tax free accumulated a year by these companies. I will call on the Internal Revenue Service to justify and reexamine their determinations in this regard.

Since 1950, stamp companies have reserved almost a billion dollars in tax-free, interest-free reserves against 384 billion stamps that remain unredeemed—S. & H. figures you have. What has happened, what happens to this money, to whom does it lawfully belong, is it not similar to other escheatable property?

Stamp companies seem to operate with a very low ratio of invested capital

July 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4079

Confounding forecasts that the American consumer would be the ultimate victim of this program, the wheat certificate plan is bringing stability to an inherently erratic situation.

It would be more to our liking if a free market could be given play in wheat production. But American overproduction in this commodity is a premise on which we must build our planning. And in that context, the wheat certificate scheme seems to be as good a solution as any.

Conservation Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this spring dedicated men and women from all sections of the country came to Washington to participate in the White House conference designed to gain public recognition of the need for conserving and beautifying our country. They left here in a highly enthusiastic and determined mood, and I am convinced that America will profit by this commendable spirit.

A lady from a small country town told me at the close of the meeting:

Since our children married and left home I am afraid that my contribution to society has amounted to little or nothing. Now I think that I can do something worthwhile in the few years that I have left on earth. I almost feel important, and I know that what I will be doing from now on in getting my friends and neighbors interested in this program will be very important.

A laudatory objective, Mr. Speaker, and my observation was that this attitude was general among those who took part in the conference. Yet you and I know that the success of the program to conserve and to beautify our country will depend largely upon the interest that is generated by the press and other communications media. For this reason I am especially pleased that the National Wildlife Federation and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation have joined in formulating a program of National and State awards to recognize and encourage outstanding contributions in conservation and the preservation of natural beauty.

The program has been explained by Louis D. McGregor, of Flint, Mich., president of the federation, and James T. Griffin, of Chicago, president of Sears Foundation:

We believe this new awards program will stimulate efforts at the local, State, and national level to more wisely use all our natural resources, as well as preserve or restore the natural beauty of our countryside.

Financed by grants from the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, the awards program will encourage renewed dedication and action among professional and citizen conservationists throughout our land. We trust this recognition of conservation leaders will likewise stir a new awareness among all Americans of the need to conserve and wisely manage our soils, waters, forests, rangelands, plant life, and wildlife upon which the Nation's economic and social well-being are based.

This new program will also recognize outstanding contributions to conservation being made by public communications media, for without public interest and understanding conservation efforts cannot succeed. Awards will be made to newspapers, radio and television stations, magazines, broadcasters, outdoor writers, and other communicators who help spread the conservation message throughout America.

Although this cooperative program has been in the planning state for many months, it has been initiated in immediate response to the President's White House Conference calling for public recognition of the need to conserve and beautify our country.

The awards program will be conducted on both State and National levels. Each cooperating State affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation will establish its own awards program, with recognition of individuals, groups and organizations for outstanding effort in 10 categories:

First. State Conservationist of the Year.

Second. Wildlife Conservationist of the Year.

Third. Soil Conservationist of the Year.

Fourth. Water Conservationist of the Year.

Fifth. Forest Conservationist of the Year.

Sixth. Youth Conservationist of the Year.

Seventh. Conservation Educator of the Year.

Eighth. Legislative Conservationist of the Year.

Ninth. Conservation Communications Award of the Year.

Tenth. Conservation Organization of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, the details of this meritorious program should be circulated as widely as possible. It is my intention to send that portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD covering this message to every newspaper and radio and television station in my congressional district, and I invite you to do likewise. I shall also send copies to the White House and to the Secretary of the Interior in hopes that they will help in making the news available to all interested parties.

I congratulate the National Wildlife Federation and the Sears, Roebuck Foundation for undertaking this important and exciting awards program.



Vietnam: Four Steps to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by the distinguished Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Rusk, before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C., on June 23, 1965.

Secretary Rusk's address reaffirms the threefold objectives of U.S. policy in Vietnam as set forth by President John-

son, to wit: "determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all."

The address follows:

VIETNAM: FOUR STEPS TO PEACE

(Text of an address made by Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the American Foreign Service Association at Washington, D.C., on June 23, 1965)

It is a very great pleasure for me to be here. It is a privilege for me to salute my colleagues, present and retired, of the Foreign Service and to express to you the gratitude of President Johnson and of the American people for a service which is marked by so much competence, dedication, and personal commitment.

Two and a half months ago President Johnson spoke to the world about Vietnam at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Today I wish to talk to you on the same subject—to you who know that such problems have deep roots, to you who have lived through and worked upon such problems before, and to you who know that such matters can gravely affect the future of our Nation and the prospects for general peace.

The struggle in Vietnam has continued since April and indeed has grown the more severe. The harsh resistance of the Communists to any form of discussions or negotiation continues. The effort to destroy the freedom of Vietnam has been expanded. The trial by fire of the people of Vietnam goes on. Their own resistance has been courageous, but the need for American resolution and for American action has increased.

AGGRESSION FROM THE NORTH

The root of the trouble in Vietnam is today just what it was in April and has been at least since 1960—a cruel and sustained attack by North Vietnam upon the people of South Vietnam. Now as then, it is a brutal war—marked by terror and sneak attack, and by the killing of women and children in the night. This campaign of terror has continued throughout the spring.

Those of us who have not served in Vietnam may find it hard to understand just how ugly this war of aggression has been. From 1961 to the present date the South Vietnamese Armed Forces have lost some 25,000 dead and 51,000 wounded. In proportion to population, these South Vietnamese losses are 10 times as great as those suffered by Americans in the Korean war, and larger than our losses in World War II.

Even more terrible than these military losses are the cruelties of assassination and kidnaping among civilian officials and ordinary citizens. In the last 18 months, for example, more than 2,000 local officials and civilians have been murdered. When an official is not found at home, often his wife and children are slain in his place. It is as if in our own country some 35,000 civic leaders or their families were to be killed at night by stealth and terror.

These are the methods of the Vietcong. This is the test to which the people of Vietnam have gallantly responded.

Meanwhile, from the North, heavy infiltration has continued. Intelligence now shows that some 40,000 had come down before the end of 1964. Toward the end of that year—well before the beginning of our own air operations against North Vietnam—the infiltration of regular North Vietnamese army units was begun, and important elements of that army are now known to be in place in South Vietnam and Laos, where they have no right to be.

And so we face a deliberate and long-matured decision by a persistent aggressor to raise the stakes of war. Apparently this was their answer to our own repeated affirmation that we ourselves did not wish a larger war. Apparently a totalitarian regime has once again misunderstood the desire of demo-

A4080

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1965

cratic peoples for peace and has made the mistake of thinking that they can have a larger war without risks to themselves. And hence the airstrikes against military targets in North Vietnam.

These actions have made infiltration harder. They have increased the cost of aggression. Without them South Vietnam today would face still stronger forces from the North.

These measured air operations have done what we expected them to do—neither more nor less. For air attack alone cannot bring peace. I cannot agree with those who think it wrong to hit the logistics of aggression. It is the aggression itself that is the wrong. Those who worry about bridges and barracks and ammunition dumps would do well to give their sympathy instead to the daily victims of terror in South Vietnam.

EFFORTS TO NEGOTIATE

The other side is obviously not yet ready for peace. In these last months, the friends of peace in many lands have sought to move this dangerous matter to the conference table. But one proposal after another has been contemptuously rejected.

We and others, for example, have sought to clear a way for a conference on Laos, and a conference on Cambodia—two neighboring countries where progress toward peace might be reflected in Vietnam itself. But these efforts have been blocked by North Vietnam and by Communist China.

Twice there has been an effort at discussions through the United Nations—first in the Security Council after the August attacks in the Tonkin Gulf, and later this April, when Secretary General U Thant considered visits to Hanoi and Peiping to explore the possibilities of peace. But in August there was a refusal by Hanoi to come to the Security Council. And in April both Hanoi and Peiping made it clear that they would not receive U Thant, and both regimes made plain their view that the United Nations is not competent to deal with that matter.

Repeatedly our friends in Britain, as a cochairman of the Geneva Conference, have sought a path to settlement—first by working toward a new conference in Geneva and then by a visit of a senior British statesman. But the effort for a conference in Geneva was blocked, and the distinguished British traveler was told that he should stay away from Peiping and Hanoi.

Twice in April we made additional efforts of our own. In Baltimore the President offered unconditional discussions with the governments concerned. Hanoi and Peiping called this offer a "hoax." At that time the 17 nonaligned nations had appealed for a peaceful solution, by negotiations without preconditions. This proposal was accepted on our side. It was rejected by Hanoi and by Peiping. And some of its authors were labeled "monsters and freaks."

The President of India made constructive proposals—for an end of hostilities and an Afro-Asian patrol force. To us this proposal was full of interest and hope. But by Hanoi and Red China it was rejected as a betrayal.

Our own Government and the Government of South Vietnam, in May, suspended air attacks on North Vietnam. This action was made known to the other side to see if there would be a response in kind. This special effort for peace was denounced in Hanoi as a "wornout trick" and denounced in Peiping as a "swindle." To those who complain that that so-called "pause" was not long enough, I would simply report that the harsh reaction of the other side was fully known before the attacks were resumed. And I would also recall that we held our hands for more than 4 years while tens of thousands of armed men invaded the south and every attempt at peaceful settlement failed.

HANOI'S RESPONSE

Reports in the first half of June have confirmed that all these violent rejections are in fact what they appear to be—clear proof that what is wanted today in Hanoi is a military victory, not peace, and that Hanoi is not even prepared for discussions unless it is accepted in advance that there will be a Communist-dominated government in Saigon, and unless too—so far as we can determine—American forces are withdrawn in advance.

So this record is clear. And there is substance in Senator FULBRIGHT's conclusion that "It seems clear that the Communist powers still hope to achieve a complete victory in South Vietnam and for this reason are at present uninterested in negotiations for a peaceful settlement." For the simple truth is that there is no lack of diplomatic there is no procedural miracle through which a desire for peace can be registered—that there is no procedural miracle through which peace can be obtained if one side is determined to continue the war.

As I have said, Hanoi is presently adamant against negotiation or any avenue to peace. Peiping is even more so, and one can plainly read the declared doctrine and purpose of the Chinese Communists. They are looking beyond the current conflict to the hope of domination in all of southeast Asia—and indeed beyond. But one finds it harder to understand Hanoi's aversion to discussion. More immediately than the Chinese, the North Vietnamese face the costs and dangers of conflict. They, too, must fear the ambitions of Communist China in southeast Asia. Yet they are still on the path of violence, insisting upon the forceful communization of South Vietnam and refusing to let their brothers in the south work out their own destiny in peace.

In recent weeks, after 2 months of reduced activity, the enemy has sharply quickened the tempo of his military action in the south. Since early May, major Vietcong units have returned to the battlefield, and already a series of sharp engagements has shown us that the fighting through the summer may be hard. Setbacks have occurred and serious defeats have been avoided only by the combination of continuing Vietnamese bravery and effective air and other types of support.

Losses on both sides have been heavy. From April 1 to date, we have had confirmed reports of almost 5,000 Vietcong dead, almost 3,000 South Vietnamese, and almost 100 Americans. We must expect these losses to continue—and our own losses may increase.

ROLE OF U.S. FORCES

Since March we have deployed nine battalions of fighting men to South Vietnam. Six more are on their way. For as the President said in April, "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired * * *. We will do everything necessary * * * and we will do only what is * * * necessary."

Our own battalions in South Vietnam have three related tasks. Their first assignment was and is to guard such major installations as the airfield at Da Nang. A second and closely related task is that of active patrol in nearby areas. And the third is to join in combat support of Vietnamese forces—when such help is requested and when our commander, General Westmoreland, believes it should be given.

American forces so committed will carry with them the determined support of our people. These men know, as all our people know, that what they do is done for freedom and peace, in Vietnam, in other continents, and here at home.

SUPPORT FOR U.S. ACTION

In authorizing combat missions for our ground forces in Vietnam, the President acted to meet his constitutional responsibilities as Commander in Chief. He has recognized the obligations of this nation under the South-

east Asia Treaty, which the Senate approved by a vote of 82 to 1. He has acted under the joint resolution of August 1964, which passed the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2—and passed the House with no opposing vote. This resolution expresses our national readiness—as the President determines—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States" and "all necessary steps, including the use of armed force" to help Vietnam and southeast Asian members of the SEATO who ask for help to preserve their freedom.

The President has acted on the unanimous advice of the American leaders in Saigon and his senior civil and military advisers in Washington.

He has acted in full consultation with the Government of South Vietnam.

And he has acted on his own considered judgment of what is necessary at this time to stop aggression.

This decision—like all of our decisions in Vietnam—is open to review by Members of the Congress and open to reversal if it does not have their support. But the leaders of the Congress have been kept in close touch with the situation, and no such prospect should stimulate the hopes of enemies or the fears of friends. For America is not divided in her determination nor weak in her will.

In Vietnam today we face one more challenge in the long line of dangers we have, unhappily, had to meet and master for a generation. We have had to show both strength and restraint—courage and coolness—for Iran and for Greece, for Berlin and for Korea, in the Formosa Strait, and in the Cuban missile crisis. We mean to show the same determination and coolness now.

In 1954 President Eisenhower pledged our support to the Government of Vietnam, to assist that Government, as he put it, "in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." And this determination was reaffirmed again and again by President Kennedy. "We are going to stay here," he said. "We are not going to withdraw from that effort." And that is our position still.

FIRMNESS AND RESTRAINT

Now, as in April, as the President put it, "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom that we can command." For it is others, and not we, who have increased the scale of fighting. It is others, and not we, who have made threats of gravely widened conflict. The firmness with which we resist aggression is matched by the firmness with which we will refrain from ill-advised adventure.

A few—a very few—may believe that unlimited war can take the place of the sustained and steady efforts in which we are engaged, just as there may be a few—a very few—who think we should pull out and leave a friendly people to their fate. But the American people want neither rashness nor surrender. They want firmness and restraint. They expect courage and care. They threaten no one. And they are not moved by the threats by others.

ROLE OF SOUTH VIETNAM

This contest centers in the defense of freedom for the people who live in South Vietnam. The sustained and increasing infiltration from North Vietnam has required the measured use of air attack on military targets in the north. We alone cannot determine the future—could we do so there would be a prompt peace. The other side, too, must decide about the future. And we must hope they know—as we do—that increased aggression would be costly far beyond the worth to the aggressor.

The political turmoil in South Vietnam has continued. It is easy to be impatient

July 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4081

with our friends in Saigon as they struggle to establish and sustain a stable government under the stress of war. We see there the ferment of a society still learning to be free, even while under attack from beyond their borders.

We must remember that this ancient people is young in its independence, restless in its hopes, divided in its religions, and varied in its regions. The turmoil of Vietnam needs the steadfastness of America. Our friends in Vietnam know, and we know, that our people and our troops must work and fight together. Neither of us can do the work of the other. And the main responsibility must always be with, and is fully accepted by, the South Vietnamese. Yet neither of us can "go it alone." We would not be there without the urgent request for assistance from those whose land this happens to be. We have a tested faith in the enduring bravery of the people of Vietnam, and they, in turn, can count on us with equal certainty.

FORMULA FOR PEACE

The people of Vietnam long for peace. And the way to peace is clear. Yesterday the foreign minister of South Vietnam set forth the fundamental principles that can provide a "just and enduring place." Those principles, in summary, are:

And end to aggression and subversion.

Freedom for South Vietnam to choose and shape for itself its own destiny "in conformity with democratic principles and without any foreign interference from whatever sources."

As soon as aggression has ceased, the ending of the military measures now necessary by the Government of South Vietnam and the nations that have come to its aid to defend South Vietnam; and the removal of foreign military forces from South Vietnam.

And effective guarantees for the independence and freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

Now these are the fundamental steps. This is what the arguing and the fighting is all about. When they are carried out, we can look forward, as we have stated previously many times, to the day when relations between North Vietnam and South Vietnam can be worked out by peaceful means. And this would include the question of a free decision by the peoples of North and South Vietnam on the matter of reunification.

This forthright and simple program meets the hopes of all and attacks the interests of none. It would replace the threat of conquest by the hope of free and peaceful choice.

A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

And even while these hopes of peace are blocked for now by aggression, we on our side and other nations have reaffirmed our deep commitment to the peaceful progress of Vietnam and southeast Asia as a whole. In April the President proposed to the nations of Asia and to the United Nations that there be constructed a new program of support for Asian efforts and called upon Mr. Eugene Black to assist them. Now in June this work is underway. The Mekong River project has been given new life. A new dam is ready to rise in Laos. A billion-dollar bank is in the making for the development of southeast Asia. And in Vietnam itself new impetus has been given to programs of development and education and health.

So let us call again on other nations—including the Soviet Union—to join in turning this great region of the world away from the waste and violence of a brutal war. For the hope of Asia is not in relentless pressure for conquest. It is in unremitting hope for progress—a progress in which rice production could be multiplied manifold, where the expectation of life could be doubled, the education of the young could be tenfold what it is today, and there could be an end of cholera and tuberculosis and intestinal parasites and other human afflictions.

In April the President offered determination against aggression, discussion for peace, and development for the human hopes of all. And in June we reaffirm that threefold policy.

Aggression has increased, so that determination must be greater than ever.

Discussion is rejected, but our efforts to find a path to peace will not be stopped. We have welcomed the new initiative of Prime Minister Wilson and the Commonwealth conference and regret that it has received so little reception on the other side.

Beyond the terror of the aggressor and the firmness of our defense, we must, nevertheless, look to the day in which many new dams will be built, and many new schools opened, and fresh opportunities opened to the peoples of southeast Asia. For we must look beyond the battle to peace, past fear to hope, and over the hard path of resistance to the broad plain of progress which must lie ahead for the peoples of southeast Asia.

Memorial Ceremony for Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the late Adlai Stevenson was actively involved in the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. From that time on, the United Nations formed one of the most prominent strains in his life. He was there, in sentiment and in spirit, if not always in person, from its beginning to the time of his death.

It is fitting and proper that of the most eloquent eulogies to him, four should have been delivered before the United Nations on the day of his funeral in Illinois. There spoken by Secretary General U Thant; Carlos Sosa Rodriguez, former President of the General Assembly; Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and Archibald MacLeish, all of whom believed in Stevenson and in the United Nations. The addresses follow:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY GENERAL AT MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR ADLAI STEVENSON, JULY 19

When I first was told last Wednesday, a little before 1 p.m., that Ambassador Stevenson had died in London, I could not believe my ears. I had seen him only recently, in Geneva, less than a week before and he was so alive, and looked so well. When the news was confirmed, it took me some time to accept the fact that Adlai Stevenson had really passed away.

My first thought was to send a message of condolences to President Johnson. In my message I referred to the respect, admiration, and affection of all of his colleagues at the United Nations which Ambassador Stevenson had earned over the last 4½ years by reason of his extraordinary human qualities.

The same afternoon I referred, in a public statement, to my sense of grief and shock because, suddenly and without warning, death had struck and we had lost a good friend and a highly esteemed colleague. As I stated in that tribute, in his years at the United Nations, Ambassador Stevenson had demonstrated with rare distinction how it was possible to combine the highest form of patriotism with loyalty to the idea of international peace and cooperation.

When on December 8, 1960, it was announced that Mr. Stevenson was to be permanent representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, it seemed to everybody to be such a natural and right appointment. He was, in truth, one of the founding fathers of the United Nations, having been present at the signing of the charter in San Francisco in June 1945, and also having been closely associated with the negotiations leading up to that historic event.

Thereafter, he was the head of the U.S. delegation to the Preparatory Commission and Executive Committee of the United Nations in London, and I believe his offices were located in Grosvenor Square, close to the very spot where he collapsed last Wednesday.

Subsequently, of course, he had entered domestic politics and his direct association with the United Nations was only intermittent. But I have no doubt in my own mind that his presence at the birth of the United Nations was an important factor in the evolution of his own political thinking and in his own dedication to the noble principles and purposes of the charter.

I remember how many tributes were paid to him when he took over his duties at the United Nations. There were so many encomiums, both within and outside these walls, that they could have turned the head of a lesser man. Not so with Ambassador Stevenson. On one occasion he observed: "Flattery is like smoking—it is not dangerous so long as you do not inhale."

During the 4½ years that he served at the United Nations, he stood as the embodiment of dedication to the principles of the United Nations. His many speeches, which expressed so well his whole mental and intellectual approach, in the championship of fundamental rights, in defense of the dignity and worth of the human person, in support of the equal rights of nations large and small, were cheered and applauded by all sides of the house. He not only spoke with a rare gift of phrase, but with such an obvious sincerity that his words carried conviction.

My first contact with Ambassador Stevenson came about in 1952 when I was one of the members of the Burmese delegation to the Seventh General Assembly. This was at the time when he was the Democratic candidate for the Presidential election. His speeches were naturally fully reported in the newspapers, and I followed his campaign closely. His speeches were not only masterpieces of oratory, they were also the incisive reflections of a great man and of a great mind, in line with the best traditions of American liberal thought.

There were some during his lifetime, of course, who rated him as too liberal and too far ahead of the times. Others sought to discount his effectiveness on the score that he was too much the idealist and therefore not practical enough. This does him injustice.

The line of distinction between idealism and vision is obscure at best. Vision, certainly, is an essential attribute of statesmanship, and he was a fine statesman. In any case, what a dismal world it would be, and how unpromising its future, without spiritual lift given to mankind by the idealists who, in the courage of their conviction, chart the course and mark the goals of man's progress.

At that time I did not have any personal acquaintance with Mr. Stevenson. For me the chance came a year later when he visited Burma in 1953. On that occasion I had the opportunity to talk to him and to discuss with him many issues of current interest. Again I was greatly impressed, not only by the depth of his intellect, but equally by his breadth of vision.

From the time that Mr. Stevenson became the permanent representative of his country at the United Nations and while I was still the permanent representative of Burma, we

developed very close ties of friendship. These ties became even closer toward the end of the year when I assumed my present responsibilities, and continued to be so during the last 3½ years. I found it easy to discuss with him any current issue of importance with complete freedom, and in full frankness and friendliness.

No one can serve his country in the United Nations for long without having his moments of frustration. Ambassador Stevenson had his share of such moments, and on such occasions he confided to me his innermost thoughts, and I was struck by his completely human approach to our common problems. He seemed not only to think about them, but also to feel about them as a human being. In all such discussions I was repeatedly impressed by his dedication to the basic concepts of peace, justice, and freedom.

So many tributes have been paid to Mr. Stevenson since his sudden and tragic passing away. So many of his friends and admirers have eulogized his fine intellect, his modesty, and humility. Many have praised his felicitous style and his ready wit. Tributes have been paid to his great learning, which he carried so lightly because he was truly an educated man, a cultured man, a civilized man.

Speaking in San Francisco on June 26, 1965, on the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, Ambassador Stevenson said:

"Some of us here today who were midwives at the birth of the United Nations can never forget those days here in San Francisco in the twilight of the war, when an old world was dying and a new world was coming to birth.

"We shared an audacious dream—and launched a brave enterprise.

"It seemed so easy then—when all was hope and expectation. I remember my own sense of pride, of history, of exultation." He went on to reflect:

"In the bright glow of 1945, too many looked to the United Nations for the full and final answer to world peace. And in retrospect, that day may seem to have opened with the hint of a false dawn.

"Certainly we have learned the hard way how elusive is peace—how durable is man's destructive drive.

"We have learned, too, how distant is the dream of those better standards of life in larger freedom—how qualified our capacity to practice tolerance—how conditional our claims to the dignity and worth of the human person—how reserved our respect for the obligations of law."

He then proceeded to restate, on behalf of himself, his Government and the vast bulk of his countrymen, his faith in the United Nations in the following words:

"We believe in the United Nations; we support the United Nations; and we shall work in the future—as we have worked in the past—to add strength, and influence, and permanence to all that the organization stands for in this, our tempestuous, tormented, talented world of diversity in which all men are brothers and all brothers are somehow, wondrously, different—save in their need for peace."

And he concluded by saying:

"We have the United Nations. We have set it bravely up. And we will carry it bravely forward."

Unfortunately, Adlai Stevenson is no longer with us to keep step with us in the march forward to the goals he had stated so well.

On this occasion when we are paying homage to the memory of one who has left us so large a legacy, it is fitting, I believe, to give some thought to the momentous questions of war and peace which were so close to his heart.

In my view, many governments, while unwilling to wage war, and at the same time unable to make peace, seem to have resigned themselves to the prospect of an interminable

cold war. While admittedly the cold war cannot bring down the physical holocaust on our heads, it has nevertheless already inflicted on us a tremendous moral and psychological injury which is intangible but equally destructive. The long, uneasy cold war has destroyed and mutilated not our bodies, but our minds. Its weapons are the myths and the legends of propaganda.

It has often been said that in war, the first casualty is truth. The cold war is also capable of inflicting the same casualty. The weapons designed and utilized to crush and mutilate the human mind are as potent as any of the weapons designed for physical destruction. The weapons of the cold war contaminate our moral fiber, warp our thinking processes and afflict us with pathological obsessions. These are the invisible but, nevertheless, the most devastating effects of the cold war on humanity. I believe Adlai Stevenson, in his innermost thoughts, realized these truths.

There is no doubt that Adlai Stevenson has earned a place in history—not only a place in the history of his own country, but a place in the history of this world Organization. He brought to international diplomacy, in his dignity, his gentility, and his style, a special dimension. Even more, he has earned the admiration and affection of millions of people to whom he was but a name and a legend.

This was so, I think, because so often his voice rang true as the voice of the people, his eloquence expressed the hopes and aspirations of the common man the world over. He was, in our times, in a quite unique way, the people's friend. Equally, he has earned a permanent place in the hearts of all those who knew him, and today I mourn his passing, not just as a great historical figure, a famous man, but as a true and trusted friend. As the poet says:

"Friendship is a nobler thing;
Of friendship it is good to sing."

STATEMENT BY CARLOS SOSA RODRIGUEZ (VENEZUELA), PRESIDENT OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, AT THE MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Mr. Secretary General, Mr. Secretary of State, fellow delegates, ladies, and gentlemen, it is sometimes difficult to put into words the true magnitude of a feeling, the sorrow that takes hold of the spirit in the face of the irreparable, the sadness that invades the soul in the face of hard reality. And yet, we must find words to reflect the pain that grips us at the loss of a friend who knew how to win our hearts, of a colleague who knew how to conquer our admiration, for such was for us Adlai Stevenson, the Governor, as we, his friends, used affectionately to call him.

The impact of the unexpected news, while I was on holiday in Madrid, was a hard blow for me: "Adlai Stevenson died suddenly in London." Only 3 weeks earlier we had been together in San Francisco at the commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the United Nations, and he appeared so jovial, as ever, so full of life.

Why is it that it is the good men, the men necessary to mankind, that we lose so suddenly? We must bow, however, before the inscrutable dictates of providence and resign ourselves to the will of God. Yet the vacuum left by the death of a friend we cannot but feel profoundly. We, his colleagues in the United Nations, have lost a dear and admired friend. But America has lost one of its most enlightened sons, and the United Nations one of its most faithful champions.

In this time of mourning, in which gathered here in the General Assembly, witness to so many of his brilliant interventions, we pay tribute to his memory, it seems to us that we still hear the echo of his eloquent and tempered words, the expression of a noble spirit and a high culture placed at the

service of his country, but placed also at the service of the ideals of peace and justice, advocated in the United Nations Charter.

Of the many qualities that adorned the shining personality of Adlai Stevenson, perhaps the most outstanding were his moderation and his profound human feeling. Perhaps this is the reason why he never inspired hatred but only affection, and always respect. Adlai Stevenson, like all public men, has been known to have devoted admirers and formidable adversaries, but he has never been known to have enemies. And it is because the goodness and sincerity that flowed from his personality could not allow for feelings of enmity to be forged against him.

In his distinguished public life, and especially in the United Nations where we better knew him, Stevenson always highlighted the great sense of equanimity and his constant preoccupation with the search for truth and justice. Perhaps these qualities, combined with so vast a culture which perforce opened for him horizons of doubt, at times deprived him of the necessary impetus for political triumph, but gave him instead the universal and broad understanding of the problems of our time and an acute and penetrating vision of the future, clouded neither by prejudice nor by preconceived notions.

Adlai Stevenson was a great patriot. He placed at the service of his country, unstintingly and unsparingly, the full fountain of his extraordinary intelligence, of his profound culture, and of his personal charm. And while in the service of his country he was struck down by death.

Adlai Stevenson lived and died for his country. Perhaps better than any other public figure, Adlai Stevenson gave the world an image of a modern and liberal North America conscious of the outstanding role it is called upon to play in history and conscious of the enormous responsibility derived for her from her great military and economic power. It would be difficult to classify Adlai Stevenson, from the political standpoint, as a man of the right or a man of the left. Stevenson was a liberal in the true sense of the word. He was a man free of extremism, ever respectful of the opinions and viewpoints of others, but always convinced of the force of reason, not of the reason of force. His liberal spirit was reflected in all his acts as a public figure and especially in his performance as a diplomat.

For him, negotiation and conciliation were the methods par excellence for the attainment of his aspirations, and he never lacked moderation, patience, and understanding in the fulfillment of the delicate functions entrusted to him. As an orator he was brilliant, eloquent, witty. When it was necessary to enter into polemics he could be sharp and even ironical, but at all times courteous and considerate. Socially, he was a man of the world, of great personal charm, with the simplicity and the natural manner of great men.

Adlai Stevenson leaves of his passage through life a profound imprint. He leaves in his country that owes him so much a profound mark. He leaves a mark in the United Nations which he so vigorously defended. He leaves a mark in the world which he understood so well. He leaves his imprint in the hearts of his friends who will never forget him. The death of Adlai Stevenson opens a great vacuum in the intellectual world, in the world of letters, in the world of politics, in the world of diplomacy. It leaves a vacuum in his country and it leaves a vacuum in the world.

His understanding of the true causes of present-day problems, his great concern with social affairs, his untiring defense of peace and concord among nations, his knowledge of man and his staunch defense of the ideals in which he believed—all of this manifested in his public acts, in his words, his writing

July 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4083

and his actions—had made of him the prototype of the intellectual who uses his culture for the benefit of mankind.

Stevenson was not happy with the egotistical pleasure of having a vast culture for himself. His constant preoccupation with the well-being of the less favored in the world and with the true grandeur of his country made him at all times place that culture at the service of others. That is why he will always be remembered with admiration and respect, both by his partisans and his adversaries.

The death of Adlai Stevenson will be felt most especially in the United Nations, where we had become used to having him as head of his country's delegation. There were those who agreed with the views he upheld and those who did not, but no one can deny that Stevenson, because of his great love for peace, his profound human feeling and his faith in negotiation, was at all times a guarantee in the most difficult situations. It will not be easy to fill the void that he leaves with his death.

To the great American people, to President Johnson, to Mr. Stevenson's family, I convey my words of condolence. May the good and generous man, the true and sincere statesman, the refined diplomat, the perfect gentleman, who was Adlai Stevenson rest in peace.

May these words of mine be accepted as the modest tribute of a sincere friend to the great man whose memory will continue to guide future generations in the search for peace and justice in our world.

ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH AT A MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON, IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY HALL, UNITED NATIONS, MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

I am deeply conscious of the privilege of speaking of Adlai Stevenson in this company and in this place, this room which has heard his remembered voice so often.

I am conscious too of the responsibility and burdened by it, for it is here, and perhaps only here, that something might be said of him which would touch, or almost touch, the indefinable, rare thing he was. When Adlai Stevenson spoke at the memorial service for Eleanor Roosevelt who had come home, he said, to the Rose Garden at Hyde Park for the last time, he told her friends that it was not her life they had lost—she had lived that out to the full: it was the thing she was " . . . And who can name it?"

Who can name what he was? Not I certainly. But if there is a room anywhere in which it can be spoken of, it is this one. Not because—not only because—the United Nations was, for so many years, the center of his life and of his concern, but for a different reason: because the Organization itself, the nature of the Organization, creates a perspective in which a life like Adlai Stevenson's might perhaps be seen—in which it might assume the nobility, the significance, which are its inward form.

In the ordinary context, the context to which our age is increasingly accustomed, a life like his becomes a puzzle, a contradiction, which even those who love him—and this room is full of those who love him—cannot readily resolve. Our generation, and not in the United States alone, not only in the United States—is obsessed by a view of human life which leaves no room for any human greatness or magnificence but one. Power fascinates us, and the exercise of power, and we judge our public figures by the power they dispose of, by the offices they hold which give them access to the thrust of power. Adlai Stevenson cannot be measured by these measures: cannot be known or recognized by them or even named.

He had no taste for power, no desire for it. The unforgettable speech in which he accepted the inevitability of his nomination

for the Presidency was a portrait of himself as ill-advised politically as it was personally honorable. And the two disastrous and superb campaigns which he conducted were proof that his reluctance at the start was not the reluctance of political calculation but of passionate belief. When he said, years afterward, that he would like to be remembered for those unsuccessful ventures, for those two defeats, he meant that there are some things in the life of a democracy more important than to come to power—more important ultimately than the possession of the power.

And yet, as the last few days have demonstrated, it is in terms of power or of the failure to come to power that his life is still most commonly conceived. In the shock and sorrow of his sudden death, the minds of those who wrote and spoke of him went back again and again, over and over, with admiration and regret and more sometimes than admiration or regret, to what were called the contradictions and the paradoxes of his history. He was, we were reminded, a great political figure who had never held a great political office; a master of the art of government who had governed only in his own State; a public man unsuccessful somehow in public life—too fine for it, perhaps; a Hamlet who thought too long too deeply, who doubted too scrupulously, who could never permit himself to be as sure as an American politician in the fifties were supposed to be sure, that that voice beneath the battlements urging to violence and revenge was the king his father's voice.

Well, it was true in part of course—true that he thought long and deeply—true that he had the courage of his doubts—true, too, that he was skeptical of hatred and its prophets in a day when the great majority of his fellow citizens were listening to those prophets and believing them. But the conclusions most often drawn from these observations are not true. Hamlet dies to those heartbreaking words in which the pity overwhelms the grief: Good night, sweet Prince. In Adlai Stevenson's death there is no room for pity. Those of us who mourn him and will always mourn him think of him not as a man defeated in his purpose but as a man victorious in it; not as a man whose life was a contradiction and a paradox but as a man whose life had a particular singleness, an unusual wholeness, its own law.

And it is here in this room, I think, that that wholeness best appears. For the United Nations, though it knows and suffers from our contemporary trust in power, is dedicated to another end: the subordination of power to the hope for peace—which is to say the hope for humanity. Those qualities in Adlai Stevenson which seemed, in other surroundings, to be traits of character, attributes of personality—his warmth, his charm, his considerateness, his intelligence, his humor, his devotion, his incisiveness, his eloquence—were fused here, in their employment in the noblest of all causes, to compose a complete man, a man so balanced, so harmonious as a human being, that his greatness passed almost unnoticed while he lived.

His effectiveness here, his services to this organization and to the country to which his life was given, others have spoken of and will speak. They were great services, greatly rendered. But the most important thing about them, or so it seems to me, was their humanity. It is not, in the long history of civilization, the accomplishment which counts but the manner of the accomplishment. Works of will are notoriously short-lived and even works of intellect can fail when the intelligence is cynical or dry. It is only when the end is reached through the human heart as well as through the human mind that the accomplishment is certain to endure. And it is for that reason that Adlai Stevenson seems certain of remembrance.

His great achievement was not political

triumph or, indeed, triumph of any kind. His great achievement was the enrichment of his time by the nature of his relationships with his time. If his intelligence was remarkable it was remarkable, even more than for its clarity, by its modesty, its humor, its total lack of vanity or arrogance. If he was one of the great articulators of his time, one of the few, true voices, it was because the words he spoke were the words of his own thought, of his deepest and most personal conviction. It was himself he gave in word and thought and action, not to his friends alone but to his country, to his world. And the gift had consequences. It changed the tone and temper of political life in the United States for a generation. It humanized the quality of international exchanges throughout a great part of the world. It enlightened a dark time.

Which means, I suppose, that Adlai Stevenson's great achievement was himself. What we have lost as he said of his friend, Mrs. Roosevelt, is not his life. He lived that, if not to the full, at least more fully than almost any other man. What we have lost is himself. And who can name the warmth and richness of it?

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK AT A MEMORIAL CEREMONY FOR AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY HALL, UNITED NATIONS, MONDAY, JULY 19, 1965

Colleagues and friends, his family and his fellow countrymen are grateful that so many from so many lands are gathered in this great hall to pay respect to Adlai Stevenson. Today he returns to the soil which gave him birth—as we gather here at the United Nations which had become the very fiber of his life.

We have been deeply moved by what has been said here today—and by the messages which have come from all over the earth. For these are messages which leap over the frontiers of nation, cultural tradition, or ideology, messages which brush aside the passing differences of present controversy and recall that Adlai Stevenson's hopes, dedication, and passionate concern encompassed all mankind.

You and we who have worked alongside him day by day have lost a talented colleague in our most stimulating profession—a profession corporately bound together in the unrelenting search for peace. And what an inspiring colleague he was.

His restless conviction that things were never good enough sustained his zest and joy in public service. But his exultation in a further step toward peace was short lived, for there was always the unfinished business still to be done—the next step which consumed his energy and imagination.

Adlai Stevenson deeply respected the colleagues with whom he labored in this United Nations and treasured the friendships nourished in this place. It is true that he had the capacity for forceful advocacy—when advocacy was needed. But he also had the perception to see that all issues worthy of debate are complex and are seen differently—and honestly—from other points of view. Thus, if his talents blazed bright from the public platform, his skills were no less luminous in the professional arts of quiet diplomacy. For he had the wisdom to seek always to see problems as they are seen by others, even though he might himself not be able to share their view.

He had the discrimination to separate the important from the unimportant. And he had the endless patience—the tolerance and restraining moderation—to sustain him through the sometimes exhausting work of mediation and accommodation.

He knew, as do all who are schooled in the great traditions of diplomacy, that it is never too early to anticipate difficulty in order to

A4084

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1965

prevent it and never too late to lay the hand of reason upon a crisis in order to solve it.

His colleagues were never bored; perhaps it was with Adlai Stevenson in mind that one editor defined a liberal as "independent and surprising." In private this public man was a warm and entertaining friend, perceptive of the ironies of politics and statecraft, given to illuminating shafts of sardonic wit, obviously worried about the behavior of nations but deeply confident about the nature of man. Because he believed so thoroughly in what he was doing and enjoyed so immensely the doing of it, he poured out his energies to the full—and to the very end.

In these past few days it has been said, over and over again, that Adlai Stevenson was a universal man. And so he was. But not merely because he was informed, well traveled, urbane, sophisticated, eloquent, and gifted; he was all of these. But his universality did not rest upon his being a prince among plain men, but upon his being a plain man even among princes. His was the simplicity of fundamental human values—with what is common in the midst of diversity—with what is permanent in the midst of change: the love of peace; the instinct of tolerance; the feeling of compassion; the devotion to human rights; the urge to act for human welfare.

This philosophy which animated Adlai Stevenson lay deep in him—permanent and indestructible. Perhaps this is what attracted him so powerfully—almost irresistibly—to the United Nations and its noble tasks. For he was committed to the principles of the charter before it was written. The preamble and the first two articles of the charter put into words what had already guided his life. And so it seems most natural that he should have spent so much of his energies in the cause of the United Nations.

He began in 1945 as an assistant to the Secretary of State and adviser to the U.S. delegation at the Charter Conference in San Francisco. He was the chief of our delegation at the Preparatory Commission in London, then a delegate to the first and second sessions of the General Assembly. It was altogether fitting that his lifework was crowned in these halls—that his last mission was to the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

The words of the charter—and his own ringing phrases which will live in literature—were more than symbols to him. They were calls to action. He used language as few men have—but used it to summon himself and others to work.

The work to which he summoned our reason and our feelings remains still to be done. The charter he kept on his desk contains only 5 pages of philosophy, followed by 50 pages of procedure.

He knew that the philosophy could lift men's vision and sustain their energies. But he also sensed that its meaning was contained not in eloquent words but in agreed procedures, in workable machinery, in arrangements that enabled the nations to work together on particular tasks—while continuing to argue about why they are working together and why they sometimes disagreed.

He had early learned the dictum of Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes that general propositions do not decide concrete cases, and he worked hard and long to build that executive machinery for peace which is the real alternative to the system of war by which men and nations have always lived—by which they no longer dare to live.

And so we pay tribute to a working colleague—to a professional diplomat—to a practitioner, a craftsman, an indefatigable worker for peaceful change. And in honoring him we are affirming our determination that the peace of the world will be secured.

You and I, who worked with him, will remember Adlai Stevenson not only as an inspired voice of the conscience of man; we

shall remember him and miss him and honor him, as well, as a valued professional colleague—as a brilliant public servant in the broadest and noblest sense of that term.

There is no institution which deserves such talents more than the United Nations; it calls out for the best that can be produced by the societies of man. Three Presidents of the United States sent Adlai Stevenson to the United Nations. They sent you our best.

Now that he is gone I think of the line from "Pilgrim's Progress": "So he passed over and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side." Yet something of him remains with us in this great Assembly hall.

Fe. Hon. Coelan
Buildup in Vietnam: Some Pointed Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, two recent editorials by the New York Times raise important questions and cast the present conflict, along with any new U.S. buildup in Vietnam, in essential perspective.

As the New York Times wisely suggests, between complete and immediate withdrawal and forcing Hanoi to sue for peace on American terms, "there is a whole gamut of possible settlements that would not be at all dishonorable to any except those demanding a complete victory over the Vietcong and North Vietnam."

It is in this context, as the Times indicates, and as I have pointed out on previous occasions, that positions standing on "American honor" and "our word" must be seriously questioned.

And, as the Times quite correctly points out, if the United States should become engaged in a major and protracted land war in southeast Asia, "the temptation is obvious to Communist China to exert pressure in Korea, and to the Soviet Union to do the same in Berlin—two tinderbox areas where the American commitment is even deeper than in Vietnam, and the American interest more vital."

Mr. Speaker, these are pointed and pertinent observations that deserve our thoughtful attention.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, July 21, 1965]

BUILDUP IN VIETNAM

The most recent visit of Secretary of Defense McNamara and Ambassador-designate Lodge to Vietnam has come at a time when the Vietnamese war appears to be escalating to the proportions of a different and more sinister Korea. It comes, too, after both President Johnson and Mr. McNamara have warned the Nation that the limited Reserve callup, extension of enlistments and increased draft calls might be necessary.

Plainly, the visit marks the failure of one policy and the substitution of another. Until now, the policy the United States has been following in Vietnam was based upon a plan evolved by Gen. Maxwell Taylor, who, when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, vigorously opposed large commitment of

American combat units to the Asiatic continent.

It is now clear that President Johnson is formulating a Vietnamese policy geared to the concept of committing increasing numbers of ground troops to offensive operations against the Vietcong in the south and to severing the Vietcong supply lines to the north. Public thinking is being prepared for a buildup of American military strength in Vietnam to something in the neighborhood of 200,000 men, and there is no certainty that even that will prove enough.

Escalation has its own perverse logic; the less effective it proves, the more insistent become the demands to do more and more. This is among the greatest of the dangers against which the United States must guard as it starts down an increasingly perilous path in Asia. The bombing of Communist supply lines in North Vietnam has obviously failed to destroy the combat capabilities of the Vietcong—so now demands are heard for bombing Hanoi and Haiphong and thus vastly increasing the threat of direct intervention by Peking and Moscow.

It is obviously futile to bemoan the past miscalculations that have contributed to making the present options so somber; the immediate problem is to make sure that new investment in men and materiel is made on terms that offer maximum hope for effectiveness at minimum cost in casualties and minimum risk of extending the war.

To send large numbers of American troops into the jungles to compete with the Vietcong in guerrilla combat would surely mean heavy losses, with doubtful prospect of discouragement to the enemy. A more promising strategy—and one more likely to hold down the toll in American lives—is that of utilizing overwhelming superiority in air and sea power to retain defensible areas along the coast.

The shakiness of the Government of Saigon and the terrible strain the long conflict has put upon the Vietnamese people complicate the difficulties; but they make even more urgent the broad endeavor this country has initiated to develop programs for raising economic standards in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

In the United States, now facing—as in the Berlin crisis—a limited mobilization, there must be immediate attention by Congress and the Pentagon to the serious personnel and materiel deficiencies, not only of the regular services but also of the National Guard and Reserves. The combat effectiveness and readiness of the Armed Forces and their reserves have been impaired for many reasons, including long overstrain and stretching available forces too thinly to cover too many commitments.

Herein, of course, lies another danger, probably the most serious of all. As the American land force commitment in Vietnam increases, so does the likelihood of Communist military pressure in one or another part of the world where the United States is equally committed—and with better reason. If the United States does become enmeshed in this major land war in southeast Asia, the temptation is obvious to Communist China to exert pressure in Korea, and to the Soviet Union to do the same in Berlin—two tinderbox areas where the American commitment is even deeper than in Vietnam, and the American interest more vital.

[From the New York Times, July 22, 1965]

AMERICAN HONOR IN VIETNAM

Speaking of Vietnam in a recent press conference President Johnson said: "Our national honor is at stake. Our word is at stake." It was not the first time that the administration has taken this position, but the emphasis and the timing of Mr. Johnson's remark gave it special importance.

July 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4085

The commitment involved in the President's statement is so portentous that it deserves careful examination. Obviously, if the honor of the Nation is at stake to such a degree that American aims must be achieved, then the struggle is a war to the finish whatever the cost. If the United States were to lose its honor in Vietnam, it would lose its predominant place in world affairs, while the Communist bloc would win a victory of staggering proportions. This, clearly, would be unacceptable.

But the question does arise whether the honor of the United States is at stake in such a drastic and precise sense of the word. If the United States were to give up, pull out of Vietnam and leave the country to its fate there would, of course, be a loss of honor—but very few Americans would argue for such a solution today. Between doing that and forcing Hanoi to sue for peace on American terms there is a whole gamut of possible settlements that would not be at all dishonorable to any except those demanding a complete "victory" over the Vietcong and North Vietnam.

A statement like the one Mr. Johnson made arouses uneasiness because of its categorical nature. The stakes in the Vietnamese conflict are being raised steadily. The Vietnamese conflict—and no one needs to tell this to Washington—holds within it the possibility of a war with Communist China and a world war.

It is neither cynicism nor appeasement to point out that the word "honor" is not a scientific but an emotionally charged term of very high voltage. If President Johnson means that Americans would not accept a defeat so humiliating that it represents a loss of national honor, he is right. The risk comes in determining when, if or how honor would be lost. There are even such things as honorable defeats and dishonorable victories. And in between are all kinds of compromises that are neither one thing nor another—but sensible and realistic.

In international politics it is wise to avoid extreme positions. American honor must by all means be preserved; it should, however, be given a reasonable connotation.

A Statement of Peter W. Rodino, Jr., in Commemoration of the 13th Anniversary of the Puerto Rican Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we commemorated the 13th anniversary of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In doing so, we recognize the quality of a people who have proved themselves capable of governing themselves through representative institutions.

Any people who have undertaken and advanced the industrial development of their land by their own initiative as have the people of Puerto Rico must be qualified likewise to take responsibility for their own political affairs.

In a few decades the Puerto Rican people have increased the industrial productivity of their land many times over. They have done so not by means of totalitarian control over the minds

and bodies of persons, but by the exercise of personal freedom and initiative.

And their industrial accomplishment, which renders their initiative and intelligence apparent for all to see, has enhanced in the people of Puerto Rico that self-confidence which is the indispensable foundation of democratic self-government.

In 1940, Puerto Ricans lacked three factors essential to production. They lacked capital; they lacked raw materials; and they lacked technical know-how.

The Economic Development Administration, popularly called Fomento, is a public agency established in 1942 which has invited, encouraged, and fostered private enterprise on the island. It does so by helping manufacturers find investment funds. It rents factory buildings at low rentals with a view to eventual purchase by producers. It makes studies to determine advantageous possibilities of production. It gives workers the opportunity to acquire skills needed by industry.

In 1949, there were 52 factories in Puerto Rico. At the present time, there are more than a thousand.

Industrialization is making up more and more for the island's lack of materials for manufacture. It is doing so in two ways: first, by increasing exports so that more materials for industry can be imported; second, by producing such materials as chemicals and textiles.

As far as scientific and technological know-how is concerned, Puerto Ricans have displayed a remarkable determination to acquire vocational training and higher education. Many hundreds of Puerto Ricans are taking vocational training courses today, and enrollment at the University of Puerto Rico has increased more than four times over since 1940.

The sense of responsibility with which Puerto Ricans face public issues, and the praiseworthy degree of voter participation, render meaningful their step-by-step advance toward political autonomy.

By the Foraker Act of 1900, Puerto Ricans had the right only to elect their representatives in the lower house of the legislature. The President of the United States appointed the members of the upper house, as well as the Governor and his cabinet.

The Jones Act of 1917 granted U.S. citizenship to Puerto Ricans and the right to elect the members of the senate as well as the house of delegates.

An amendment to the Jones Act in 1947 provided for popular election of the Governor. The people elected as their first Governor the man who had shown the way toward economic development, social justice, and political liberty—Luis Muñoz Marin, leader of the Popular Democratic Party.

The constitution which the Puerto Rican people adopted and which went into effect on July 25, 1952, provides for popular self-government with respect to insular affairs and provides at the same time the advantages of Federal union. The political status of Puerto Rico is unique. It is that of an associated free state—Estado Libre Asociado.

I am sure that I speak for all members in congratulating Governor Roberto Sánchez-Vilella; the distinguished Resident Commissioner, SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU, and the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on this anniversary commemoration of their constitution.

Bank Hosts Bay State's Counterpart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, recently, 14 members of the Partners of the Alliance Committee in Medellin, Antioquia, Colombia, visited the United States to attend the first Inter-American Partners of the Alliance Conference here in Washington and to visit their counterpart Partners Committee in Massachusetts.

One of the leaders of the Massachusetts committee has been John A. W. Richardson, vice president of the International Division of the First National Bank of Boston.

The recent house publication of the bank described the visit of the Antioquians to Massachusetts and outlined the outstanding program arranged for them by committee chairman, Anthony Faunce.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BANK HOSTS BAY STATE COUNTERPART

Fourteen Colombian businessmen and educators were guests of the Bank last month during their visit to Massachusetts as part of the Massachusetts-Antioquia Partnership for Progress. Antioquia is one of the leading departments ("state" in this country) of Colombia and is similar in many ways to the Bay State.

The Colombians returned a visit to Antioquia made last winter by a group from Massachusetts. They were greeted in Washington on the first leg of their journey north by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY (Democrat of Massachusetts), and by Representative F. BRADFORD MORSE (Republican of Lowell), chairman and vice chairman respectively of the Massachusetts committee of the Partnership for Progress, and John A. Sisto, assistant vice president.

ATTEND CONFERENCE

During their 2-day stay in the Capital, the Colombian businessmen attended the first inter-American conference of the "Partners of Alliance," and met with State Department officials. Highlight of the conference was an address by Secretary of State Dean Rusk who was introduced by John A. W. Richardson, vice president, of the International Division, and a member of the Massachusetts committee.

Purpose of the trip to the Bay State was to study modern industrial and educational techniques.

TOUR BANK

On their itinerary was a tour of the data processing center, where they were also guests of the Bank for lunch, plus a study of the Head Office.

Part of the Alliance for Progress, Massachusetts-Antioquia is designed to help Colombians compare their activities with

A4086

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 27, 1965

those of a political subdivision similar to theirs.

Massachusetts and Antioquia industrialized early, have heavy investments in the textile industry, and "have business groups which have won success through hard work, imagination and judgment."

SAME PROBLEMS

Moreover, the states face similar problems in areas of water pollution, industrialization, automation, and unemployment.

Antioquia itself is 1 of the 17 departments of Colombia, having 2.5 million people out of a total Colombian population of 17 million and comprising 5½ percent of the nation's total area. Its capital, Medellin, has a population of 780,000. The climate ranges from tropical along the coast to pleasant 70-degree year-round temperatures at Medellin.

INDUSTRIALIZED EARLY

There are over 2,200 miles of roads in Antioquia which produces 75 percent of the gold and 85 percent of the silver output of the country. There are also large coal resources and an oilfield within the department.

Because of the early importance of mining, the poverty of the soil, potential power sources, and early trade contacts, Antioquia turned to textiles, their leading products, and is now the No. 1 manufacturing center in Colombia.

Like most Latin American nations, Colombia faces severe problems of economic growth, monetary stability, and the balance of international payments. Unlike many nations, however, Colombia has a highly developed private sector. Domestic private investment is more extensive than in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, or Venezuela. Local private capital controls 17 of the top 32 enterprises in the country.

Medellin, as the industrial center of the nation, has a particularly well-developed private enterprise system. Large-scale industrial enterprises were first started in the 1920's, not by the men of landed gentry, but by mule drivers, printers, coffee merchants, and small industrialists.

Change in Eastern Europe—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the economic life of eastern and central Europe is undergoing significant transformation. The Communist model of a collectivized, party run, and centrally directed economy has not been able to withstand the test of time. Economic stagnation is driving the regimes of that area to discuss and even to adopt economic ideas, techniques, and methods prevalent in the West.

Where will this change lead? What are its symptoms—and its significance?

These and related questions are asked, and answered, by Mr. John N. Reddin, of the Milwaukee Journal, in the third and last article summarizing his impressions of "Change in Eastern Europe." The article is entitled "West's Economic Ideas Being Put To Use by Reds." Its text follows:

CHANGE IN EASTERN EUROPE—WEST'S ECONOMIC IDEAS BEING PUT TO USE BY REDS

(By John N. Reddin)

"The consumer should have the right to decide what, and what amount and quality, he wants to buy."

Government should keep hands off prices because "the mechanism of competition solves the problem of prices with a sufficient degree of accuracy."

Government should interfere with the economy "only when the operation of competition or of the law of supply and demand is violated."

"It is not the business of the central authorities to decide what should be produced and in what quantity. This is a matter for industry to decide."

These statements could come from almost any American businessman. But they come from Edgen Loeb, a Czechoslovakian economist and longtime Communist. They are widely discussed with interest in Eastern Europe, and indicate an upheaval of economic theory.

POLITICAL EFFECT SEEN

Loeb's ideas have not all gone into practice. But that they are considered seriously is striking, for they would turn the Iron Curtain to lace.

This is an upheaval that is bound to have far-reaching political effect. If the Communist Party gives up centralized economic controls, it gives up a major base of power.

To talk with east European economists is a revelation. A Yugoslav says: "We had to change economic theory because our chickens came home to roost."

A Hungarian asks: "What are interest rates in Rumania?"—and interest rates used to be Communist anathema.

A Czech says: "We have got to rely on the profit system to give people incentives."

A Rumanian says: "We were wrong to try to copy the Soviet Union's economic policies."

CONSUMER GAINS STATURE

Suddenly the consumer has become a very important man. He has been ignored and neglected to the point where he was becoming politically dangerous and unproductive. Throughout the bloc for two decades, planners tried to run economies from the top. They relied on production quotas rather than on the law of supply and demand. As a result, goods were inadequate, defective and not consumer oriented.

Various publications ridiculed these conditions. A cartoon in a Czech paper showed a factory manager telling a workman: "Now that the plan is being overfulfilled, we will need bigger warehouses in which to store defective unsold goods."

Too many factory managers have not been qualified. They got jobs because they were Communists. Arthur E. Stejskal, another Czech, wrote that if the state planned to give more responsibility to factory managers, as it does, it must do something about finding qualified people. Only 23 percent of present factory managers are qualified, he said, and 30 percent of engineers. Only 14 percent of foremen have been trained adequately. And "60 percent of the leading personnel are inadequately qualified" in the overall economy.

The tendency now is to tell factory managers that they must make a profit and compete in the marketplace. Some have latitude in setting wages and so can give workers incentive to produce more and of better quality. These things, standard in the western world, fly in the face of Communist theory. Even Neanderthal Walter Ulbricht, East German Communist boss, talks of supply and demand as though it were a Socialist discovery.

BUSINESS "REPRIVATIZED"

A horrible, but important, word in the eastern bloc is "reprivatization." It means return of activities from the public to the private sector of the economy. It certainly is not yet widespread. But it applies in some degree to artisans and craftsmen. It is virtually impossible for some people to find anyone to fix a television set, an electric iron, plumbing.

In Poland, a number of areas are "reprivatized"—including furniture, optical and precision instruments, service establishments. The state leases restaurants to some private operators and lets them hire up to 15 employees—30 if it is a resort cafe operating only in summer. The Czechs have reprivatized laundries, shoeshining, small tailor shops, carwashing, catering, and hairdressing. Hungary is extending areas where private operators are allowed.

There has been an artisan underground, with men working on the sly on their own time to furnish repair services. Most such violations are overlooked.

BANK PRACTICE CHANGED

All the nations save Poland, where most farms are in private hands, face the embarrassing fact that small private producers turn out much more production proportionally than state farms. There is talk of relying more on private farmers, although mechanization may increase state output if the governments are willing to put many present farmers out of jobs.

Yugoslavia has decentralized its banking system and has local banks which can extend credit directly to enterprises. The banks have directing boards who, when approving loans, must make sure that they are sound and profitable. Firms unable to get credit because of unsound practices will go out of business, officials insist. Other East European nations are beginning similar steps in one degree or another.

Carried to a conclusion over a few years, the result of all this must be a system not unlike that of the West. Professional managers will run factories. Boards dominated by local persons will supervise the managers. Factories will compete for raw materials, labor, production efficiency, and customers. The process of achieving all of this probably will have fits and starts and may not get far off the ground in some nations. But starts have been made.

SEEK WESTERN TRADE

The East bloc nations are increasingly interested in cooperation with Western firms. The Czech Government trade enterprise Kovo now has an association with the British firm of A. E. Callaghan & Sons, producers of textile machines.

Yugoslavia has contracted with Pan American World Airways to run a hotel in Zagreb. Poland has been dicker with the once despised Krupp combine of West Germany. Hungarian officials think that West Germany and France, because of labor shortages, might subcontract to Hungarian firms and say they have 200 projects under consideration. West European businessmen are swarming through East Europe.

Shades of Stalin, Marx, and Lenin—and of all living oldtime Communists. Their theories and doctrines are being turned inside out. That capitalism is coming to Eastern Europe officials indignantly deny. They are just "borrowing" proved methods and economic practices. But they are on the road to some form of capitalism.

UNITED STATES PRODUCES "BEST"

A further spur in this direction is inherent in the frantic desire of all these countries to trade with the United States. Except for Yugoslavia and Poland, the nations

July 27, 1965

A4089

Such statements will be completely understood by those who successfully struggle for the solution of many problems. They must have discovered by now the secret of real creation. And I hope that they will also be understood by those who are only now starting their career. Such truths are not unique in the design process; other artists have also found them; I will mention a similar conviction of a great poet, T. S. Eliot: "The progress of an artist is a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction of personality."

Technology and Connecticut Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an address by Arthur B. Bronwell, dean of the school of Engineering, University of Connecticut, located at Storrs, in my congressional district. The address was delivered last April at the conference on scientific and technological briefing for management held at the university.

Entitled "Changing Horizons in Technology," it discusses the course of technology and its effects on industry and our Nation's economic development in the future. I am pleased to commend this address to all my colleagues and to the public generally because it contains some very interesting views and thoughts. It reads as follows:

CHANGING HORIZONS IN TECHNOLOGY

(By Arthur B. Bronwell, dean of engineering, University of Connecticut)

In the course of a nation's development there are turning points when new outlooks, new perspectives and new goals are needed. I believe that today we are at one of those turning points, and that the future course of technology, as well as of industry and of our Nation's economic development, will be profoundly affected thereby.

We in Connecticut live in a prosperous State which has a thriving technologically oriented industry. Connecticut, perhaps as much as almost any State in the Union, has profited by the bounties of modern technology. A quick run-down on some of the products—electronics, chemicals, atomic powered submarines, jet engines, helicopters, metals, nuclear power, plastics, infrared, space exploration, and fuel cells—provides convincing evidence of this fact. A strongly science-oriented company doesn't necessarily have to be a large company, for some very successful and aggressive ones are small companies. But it must have certain ingredients, among these being a management that understands modern technology and gives it full support; a research-oriented program staffed with alert, competent and creative engineers and scientists; and an organization throughout that can successfully implement technological goals.

It is becoming increasingly clear that large segments of our Nation's industries are technologically impoverished, and that this is a matter of grave national consequence. The major impact of technology has been in those industries that are either military or space oriented. In industries such as electronics, chemicals, aeronautics, and the space sciences, the billions of dollars of Federal support have produced miraculous transformations. These industries boast of the finest research laboratories in the world staffed

by the ablest scientific and engineering brains that money can buy.

Nothing succeeds like success is the age-old maxim. And success can compound itself rapidly when it is backed by the multi-billion dollar military preparedness program and the equally beneficent space exploration program.

But the lost voice is that of the civilian industries that have been bypassed by the onrush of science and technology. These industries constitute a large segment of the total of our Nation's economy. Some of them have stood on the sidelines and watched the technological procession go by. Today they are vulnerable to the ravages of foreign competition or of competition from those companies which have shared generously in the Federal bounty.

Survival of the fittest is the law of nature, and likewise it is the axiom of economic survival. Why worry about industries that fall behind? But the problem isn't this simple. The issue bites deeply. Our Nation's technological growth has been tipped on end and severely warped by the decisions of Government, primarily the decisions to build an invincible military power and to be first in the race to the moon. It is difficult to dispute these goals. Survival is our Nation's No. 1 goal, for without this all else dissolves into meaninglessness.

At a time when approximately 70 percent of the Nation's total research and development costs are supported by the Federal Government, one might well ask what happens to those companies that are not on the receiving end of this pipeline? Most of these companies have not built up research capabilities that will enable them to use modern technologies—indeed they know very little about modern technology. Yet they form a large part of the backbone of our Nation's industry and its economy.

In Connecticut, we have seen enough of the bitter sting that accompanies the flight of American industry to foreign lands to know something of its consequences. The closing up of the watch manufacturing industry as it took flight to Switzerland; the extinction of much of the typewriter industry, which has now gone off to Sweden and Italy; the flight of the textiles to Japan and England have all taught us a bitter lesson of the consequences of lagging technologies—and there are others that are now in just as precarious circumstances.

This is a compelling national problem. It is in critical need of national policy. It is all well and good for those in the industries which have built up enormous technological power through Government financed military and space contracts to boast about the invincibility of American industry in competition with foreign industries. But perhaps this is like that poetic quip: "The rain falls upon the just and the unjust. But the just get wet because the unjust have borrowed their umbrellas."

At present, we have no national policy respecting this vital sector of American industry. The "haves" and the "have nots" are pulling farther and farther apart, and the situation is growing increasingly precarious for the "have nots." Furthermore, it is not an easy matter for a company or an industry that has had no tradition in technology to suddenly launch out into research. They wouldn't know where to start, and it is unlikely that anything of consequence would be produced. Many companies are too small to support research. They acquire its benefits as a fallout from association with larger research-oriented companies.

It seems timely that we recognize that some segments of American industry are seriously lagging in technological development, and that this is an unhealthy situation for our national economy, as well as a threat to the continued survival and prosperity of these industries. Just as an example, how would one go about automating a textile company,

using the latest automation and computer methods, such as those that might be employed in an automobile manufacturing plant? This would require a whole new approach, probably entirely new designs of the machinery of production, the methods of material handling, the use of computers in scheduling and controlling machines, and a vast array of other innovations.

Indeed, automation itself is going through rapid obsolescence, as is becoming quite evident to many machine tool manufacturing companies. Computers are now used to direct, schedule, and control intricate sequential operations that in earlier days of automation were handled by relatively simple and unsophisticated methods. Automation today requires a much higher order of technological knowledge than that of even a decade ago. This is the inevitable price of progress.

We are at a turning point in industrial growth. It is the problem of inculcating research and technology in companies and whole industries that know very little about the modern technologies. To a person skilled in the advanced technologies, the difference between a science-oriented company and one which has had no research tradition is as the difference between night and day. But it is very difficult to bring on the dawn in companies that may not even be able to see the importance of technology in their own future.

I have intimated that this will become a matter of national policy. Immediately the free enterpriser recoils—government interfere with private enterprise? We'll have none of it. So let me be more explicit.

1. We must clearly recognize that there are industries in which there exists a high degree of technological vacuum and that these industries must either mount vigorous technological offensives or face economic strangulation.

2. There is no easy road in acquiring technology. It is a long, difficult climb. But its ingredients will certainly require at least the following:

(a) Technological knowledge: Management itself must become broadly knowledgeable about modern technology. Engineering staffs must crawl out of their shells of empiricisms and enlarge their outlooks with respect to the modern technologies. Frankly, we haven't done a very good job of communicating information about technology and its promising new developments. Entirely new approaches are needed.

(b) Educational programs, conferences, and workshops will be needed for management and engineering staffs. Effective means must be found to bring the vast storehouse of knowledge of the new technologies, acquired in federally sponsored research programs, into better focus.

(c) The companies themselves must clearly understand the imperative need of employing highly creative engineers and scientists to undertake research, and then avoid the temptation of circumscribing their activities too closely. Research must be given a dignified, top-level position in the company—not merely tacked on somewhere, as an appendage.

(d) Industrywide research may be necessary in order to gain rapid momentum. Research is big business. Seldom does a small company have the resources to mount a vigorous research program. The exception, of course, is the company that deals in a specialized scientific product where the president has a Ph. D. degree and is far ahead of the game. And don't be afraid that the other fellow will steal your secrets. This is a defeatist policy, as the science-oriented industries found out rather early. A company has far more to gain than to lose by throwing open wide the doors and windows to knowledge.

(e) Bring in consultants—people who are intimately acquainted with the newer tech-

July 27, 1965

nologies and who can translate this knowledge into the particular industry's problems. They will think differently. Listen to them.

(f) As much as possible of this effort should be through the initiative of private enterprise. Tax incentives—generous, encouraging, and stimulating tax incentives—will be needed. No company ever acquired technology on a shoestring, and this problem will not be licked on an austerity budget. But we must remember that some of the companies are now hanging over the cliff financially. Tax incentives are meaningless to a company that doesn't have enough earnings to pay taxes.

(g) Let us make no mistake about the order of magnitude of this undertaking. This is a big program; it will be a long-range program; and the costs will be high. Government will have a role to play, and so will the universities. Government has played quite a role in the science and technology buildup of those companies that have participated in the military and space programs. This year alone, over \$5 billion will be poured into these companies for research and development. Let's face it—Government financing is today a prime mover in our Nation's scientific and technological progress. Just contemplate for a moment what would happen to the research staffs of any one of the 20 largest companies of the Nation or what would happen to our universities if Government were to suddenly withdraw all of its research and development support. Many company executives and university officials have had nightmares over this problem. The initiative and the performance, however, must largely rest with private enterprise—and the universities.

(h) It would be a tragic mistake for Government to establish research laboratories to solve industry's problems.

(i) The universities will have an important role to play. Their engineering and science faculties are working at the very frontiers of knowledge. Through their research programs, they are contributing significantly to the development of new technologies. But above all, they are educating the people upon whom industry must depend for its technological leadership. Evening graduate study programs, such as those of the University of Connecticut—which today enrolls over 700 graduate students from industry, all of whom have completed bachelor's degrees and are working toward their master's degrees in graduate centers in Hartford, New London, Stamford, Waterbury and on the Storrs campus—provide a powerful leverage for technological advance. Research and doctoral degree programs on the university campus are contributing greatly to the discovery of new knowledge and the education of people who can provide our Nation's technological leadership. The universities will provide the focal center of much of the educational work that will be needed. But much of this will be a whole new order of magnitude of responsibility for the universities and it will require organization, manpower, and money.

Let us take a few moments to examine some of the other technological deficits that our Nation faces.

Certainly one of these which stares us in the face is the technological depravity of virtually all of our Nation's large cities. With our ICBM missiles, we can hit a gnat's eyebrow at a range of 5,000 miles. But the population living in the suburbs of any one of our major cities every day of the week is fighting a battle of hopeless confusion, congestion, and frustration in going to and from work in public transportation, much of which was technologically obsolete a quarter of a century ago. High speed, nonintersecting, luxurious public transportation that would whisk the people from their suburban homes into the center of large cities at speeds upwards of 150 miles per hour is tech-

nologically feasible today. In fact, in Japan and Europe such public transportation systems are operating. When one stops to consider the problem of instituting such systems in all of our Nation's major cities—New York, Boston, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Baltimore, Philadelphia, etc., the order of magnitude of the technological effort becomes self-evident; indeed, this item alone could easily consume a good fraction of our Nation's total technological manpower.

Coupled with this transportation problem is another of grave consequences. Most of our large cities are plagued with densely populated slums, of which the holocaust of Harlem is a prime example. Here millions of people live in culturally depraved, poverty and disease ridden communities, where they and their children so often cultivate diseased minds. We can airlift a whole army half way around the world, if necessary, to win a war, but we are powerless to lift the million or so people out of the inferno of Harlem and give them the kind of community life in which there can develop hope and visions, and which will give them the chance to contribute their talents to the betterment of mankind. Our Nation sorely needs bold new technological innovations on a large scale to develop the low-cost housing that will make the decentralization of populations economically feasible. Only in this way can we hope to reduce the cancerous blight that is eating away at the heart of all of our great cities. Although this problem may seem to be primarily political, sociological, and economic, don't overlook the contribution which modern technology can make in enormously reducing housing costs, and in providing commuter transportation for decentralization of the populations.

Every nation in the world is plagued with this large city slum problem. No nation has yet successfully combated it. But the promises of low cost housing, combined with high speed urban transportation, made possible by bold new technological ventures, can provide the greatest hope that mankind has ever had for decentralizing its populations and lifting the masses out of the smoldering ashes of desecrated cities.

The medical care of our people is a problem in which there is dire need for extensions of technological knowledge. Hospital and medical costs have skyrocketed, and only technology can restore them to reasonableness. Vastly improved diagnostic methods and computer interpretations will provide far more detailed and precise information as to the nature of physical ailments. Indeed, one can imagine a completely computerized and automated diagnostic clinic that would make all of the diagnostic tests, interpret the information, and yield the prognoses for final scrutiny and interpretation by the doctor. Today the electroencephalograph and electrocardiograph are being computerized in many medical centers to yield such interpretive information, and the information they yield often goes far beyond the physician's interpretative ability.

Just as one example, the problem of picking out defective hearts in a grade school or high school of 10,000 children can consume the time of several doctors and nurses for weeks, and even then the human fallibility in such routine diagnostic work is high. A recent invention of a former student has yielded a small instrument that makes this process completely automatic. A lamp lights up whenever a defective heart is encountered, and the testing can easily be administered by the physical education staff with accuracy far better than that possible with nurses and doctors. This would eliminate the need for most of the doctors and nurses in this part of the examination.

Artificial organs and implants, such as artificial hearts, lungs, kidneys, ears, larynxes, feet, legs, hands, arms, etc., are all possible today only because technology has been applied to the medical problem. It is

not at all farfetched to imagine a factory that would build replacement parts for humans about like we now produce replacement parts for automobiles, although one would hope that they would be installed by someone other than a greasemonkey.

But I spoke earlier of a turning point. Let me now define this more clearly. This turning point has been clearly recognized by the Engineers' Joint Council in a far-reaching study of the trends in technology, as well as by legislation which has recently been introduced into Congress at the suggestion of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The time has come when our Nation must redirect its visions, its efforts, and its technological goals. The deficits in technology in many of our civilian industries, in public transportation and urban development, and in numerous other segments of peaceful purposes are becoming so urgent and so imperative that we can no longer ignore these needs. A massive new offensive is needed in directions which are quite distinct from the military and space programs that have up to this time preempted so much of our human engineering and scientific resources. Perhaps this is less glamorous than the conquest of space and it certainly has less scare appeal than the military. But it is a compelling national problem that is in critical need of national policy.

Yes, we are at a turning point in technology. It is the problem of getting on with the business of accelerating the technological growth of industry and our public needs to better serve mankind. I have mentioned only a few of the aspects of this many faceted problem. One could go on and on, into all of the ramifications of technology—of accelerating fundamental and applied research so as to translate ideas into new technologies, of developing new resources, of developing the extractive technologies for recovering oil, metals, and other substances from the oceans, of accelerating atomic power and the uses of atomic sciences.

I have said nothing of the technological needs of underdeveloped nations, which in themselves are imperatives so gigantic that it could easily preempt all of the scientific and engineering manpower of the world, working through the most powerful instruments of industry and yet, after one generation, still leave most of the job undone. The fateful spectre of populations growing so fast that they eat up all the gains, is not a comforting thought. If one seriously explores the technological needs in all of its dimensions, as has been done by the Engineers' Joint Council, one soon gains the quite definite impression that the tasks ahead are of enormous dimensions.

Our patterns of technological growth are twisted and distorted, with great momentum and acceleration in certain areas, but with lethargy and intransigence in others that vitally affect our well-being and our national economy. We must seek to understand this distorted unbalance and find ways of achieving a more rational balance so that all sectors of technology will go forward with reasonable speed and in concert with the needs of our Nation and of humanity.

George E. Brown
The Only—But Difficult—Alternative
in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of War/Peace Report contains several excellent articles

July 27, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4091

on the Vietnam problem, as have most of its recent issues, and a thoughtful editorial analyzing the courses currently open to the United States.

The sponsors of War/Peace Report are practical men, but men dedicated to progress toward a world of law and order. In a very real sense, the only practical course for men of good will in the world today is to devote all their efforts to achieving progress toward a world of law and order.

I would like to encourage my colleagues to read the entire July issue of this valuable publication. Because of its timeliness, I am including herewith the contents of the editorial, entitled "The Only—But Difficult—Alternative in Vietnam":

THE ONLY—BUT DIFFICULT—ALTERNATIVE IN VIETNAM

There are still three basic courses open to the United States in the Vietnam war:

1. Quit, and bring the boys home.
2. "Win" the war.
3. Negotiate an end to the war.

However, there are nuances in each option. To consider the three in order:

QUIT?

1. A strong case can be made that the United States never should have gone into Vietnam in the first place. If President Roosevelt had lived longer, as is suggested in Professor Battistini's historical recapitulation in the preceding pages, the French might have been halted in their efforts after World War II to reestablish their Indochinese colony. The result could have been a Tito-like regime under Ho Chi Minh, independent of Chinese and Soviet power. In the 1954-56 period the United States worked with Ngo Dinh Diem to undermine the 1954 Geneva Agreement, which provided that free elections were to be held July 20, 1956. Ho undoubtedly would have won this election and, again, he probably would have established a Tito-like regime. There were two main reasons why Ho could have been expected to set up an independent, albeit Communist regime: First, like Tito, he was a national hero who had won his own revolutionary war, and second, the Vietnamese people have a profound antipathy for the Chinese dating back many centuries.

But all that is in the past. The United States did go in, backing the Diem tyranny and its many successors. Despite these grievous mistakes of the past, the United States as a great power simply will not admit defeat before the world and withdraw its forces. The fact is that great powers just do not do that sort of thing. Besides, through wise diplomacy the United States can still help the non-Communist South Vietnamese people, as well as maintain a better American strategic position than would result from withdrawal. Therefore, from a practical standpoint, the option of straight withdrawal by the United States must be rejected.

WIN?

2. There are still some who believe the United States can "win" the war. Among them is Herman Kahn, who in the preceding pages remarks that "the best thing to do if it is possible is to win, and, in some meaningful sense, I would guess it can be done." Playing down the ideological factor, he suggests that such gimmicks as giving "battle-field commissions to especially effective enlisted men" might bring the needed improvement in morale of the Saigon forces. We suggest that the ideological factor cannot be left out; it is, in fact, the heart of the problem. Why should a man go out and get killed for a corrupt, dictatorial, reactionary regime in Saigon? We wonder if in all Mr. Kahn's broad studies he has ever found a

single instance in history of a successful guerrilla operation in which the fighters did not believe devoutly in their cause and in their leadership. Who would willingly lay down his life for the new Premier, Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, who has ordered the building of public execution posts throughout the country to dispose of those who disagree with him? There is even less reason for Vietnamese to die for the foreigners, the Americans. Small wonder it is, then, that when the Saigon forces went on patrol seeking the Vietcong in the dangerous "Zone D" recently, they returned to their homebound pickup point 7 hours early.

Malcolm W. Browne, in his comment on Kahn's observations, makes it clear that Kahn has not offered any helpful answers. Browne says: "Give me a man with a rusty dagger, dedication, and a good knowledge of the techniques of 'dirty' political and military infighting, and I'll give you back your B-52s and divisions." It seems Browne is already being proved right about the airplanes and white-skinned troops. But, again, where would the dedication of the ground fighters come from? He suggests it might come from "a social and educational revolution at the rice roots of this unhappy nation." But could this be carried out by the military Saigon government or imposed from the outside by the Americans? Especially, could this be done with the war still going on? It seems exceedingly unlikely.

It would always be possible, in theory at least, to send in the 10 or 20 American divisions Kahn mentions to occupy Vietnam. China could be expected to enter that kind of conflict, and probably the Soviet Union, too. Even if a third world war could be avoided in such a situation—which seems doubtful—the United States would have to run a police state and practice genocide against the Vietnamese remaining in opposition.

Thus, it appears that none of the prescriptions now being offered for victory make any more sense than any of the others advanced in the last 19 years. Fortunately, the Johnson administration now seems to understand this, even though for diplomatic reasons it does not say so out loud. Secretary of Defense McNamara's press conference of June 16 was in itself a sufficient indication of this. He estimated that the regular combat forces of the Vietcong totaled 65,000 men and that in addition there are between 80,000 and 100,000 irregular guerrillas, making a total of perhaps 165,000 men. He continued: "The South Vietnamese regular and paramilitary forces facing the Vietcong total something in excess of 500,000 men. And they're facing, as I mentioned, about 165,000 guerrillas, a ratio something on the order of 4 to 1. That's considerably less than is recognized as required to effectively deal with guerrillas."

McNamara did not proceed with his arithmetic because it would have been embarrassing, but surely he has done it in private. If one uses the figures mentioned by Kahn, of 20 to 1 as the going ratio to defeat guerrillas, this would mean that an army of 3,300,000 is required to eliminate the present Vietcong force. Even with the 100,000 troops being added to the South Vietnam army and the 75,000 GIs expected to be in Vietnam soon, McNamara is still short 2,625,000 men. Should the 400,000 trained guerrillas of North Vietnam come into the war, the United States would need to add (using the same ratio of 20 to 1) an army of 8 million, which is more than three times the total number now in all U.S. services. And if the Chinese began to send in guerrillas—well, our computer got stuck on that one.

NEGOTIATE?

3. If the United States can't go home and can't win the war, that leaves only the third alternative: negotiation. However, this is not a simple procedure. Since the United States now recognizes it cannot win, it gen-

uinely seems to want to end the war. But the other side, since it is winning the war, is quite naturally less eager to negotiate. What the United States must offer is the prospect of a reasonable settlement that will be more appealing to the insurgents than a continuation of the war.

President Johnson has gone part of the way toward making negotiations possible, but he must go still further. In commenting on the pressures that have pushed him this far, he lamented in his press conference of June 18: "You remember first we had no policy. Second, we wouldn't explain it. Third, we ought to negotiate. Fourth, we ought to have a halt in the bombing of the North. These things originate and in about a month they come to us. You will find a good deal of it in the next few weeks—negotiate directly with the Vietcong."

Johnson was quite right. The pressure to include the Vietcong (more correctly, the National Liberation Front) in negotiations increased, and the administration has gradually been responding to it. Secretary of State Rusk, replying to a question on July 4 as to whether any direct talks with the Vietcong could be held, said, "Yes, they can walk into the capital tomorrow and say, 'We are prepared to be like other South Vietnamese and discuss problems of South Vietnam on a political basis, rather than by arms.'"

Johnson could have spoken more about pressures on him, for it seems likely that at least one more must be effective if negotiations are to materialize. As Walter Lippmann put it: "In the months to come he (Johnson) will have to consider whether the only course still open to him is to encourage the Vietnamese—Hanoi, Saigon, Vietcong—to negotiate with each other. If they could work out a deal among themselves, it would no doubt mean that our influence had sunk to a very low point, except as we recovered some of it in assisting the reconstruction of the country. But there may be some consolation in the fact that a Vietnamese solution made by the Vietnamese might lay the foundations of an independent Vietnam, independent of the United States to be sure, and, in some measure, independent also of China."

The comment of Huynh Tan Phat, secretary general of the National Liberation Front, made in the interview with him in this issue is revealing on this approach. He said: "What we reject is a conference without us. We have no confidence in that. But if the interested powers agree to attend a meeting of all the Vietnamese factions, letting them freely settle all their own affairs, we would not make any objection. On the contrary. The foreign powers should confine themselves to giving suggestions, taking note of the agreement arrived at by the Vietnamese and guaranteeing its implementation."

This seems reasonable enough. After all, it is their country.

In the light of this analysis, what should the United States do now? Militarily, as Senator Fulbright recently suggested, the United States should fight a holding operation until the National Liberation Front (NLF) sees it cannot force a complete U.S. withdrawal. The United States should make clear that the NLF will be included in any negotiations and, in fact, that the NLF can at some point deal directly with the Saigon government to determine the future course of South Vietnam. Once this announcement is made, it may be possible to go to the next step—a cease-fire, perhaps one of limited duration. This might be done most effectively in Moscow, since the United States, the NLF, North Vietnam, China, and the Soviet Union all have high-level representation on the spot. Saigon could be represented by the United States. Other means of achieving a cease-fire might

be through a tour of key capitals by U.N. Secretary General U Thant or the mission of the Commonwealth prime ministers. If the cease-fire could be achieved, the Saigon government, which still represents about half the people of South Vietnam, would probably require a period during which to create a representative nonmilitary government to negotiate with the NLF.

The Saigon Government and the NLF could determine whether they wanted elections in the South (which seems most likely) or in all of Vietnam. In any event, the southerners would work out what relationships they wanted with the North. Supervision on the ceasefire, and eventually the election and the withdrawal of all foreign troops, could be supervised by the U.N., or if the NLF and Hanoi balked at that, by an ad hoc international body for that purpose. As soon as possible, and this need wait for nothing, international economic aid programs should be undertaken throughout Indochina.

In this manner, or in something approximating it, the war might be brought to an end. The people of Vietnam would have peace after a generation of war. The North would have a Communist system, which it already has, but it would be enabled to keep freer of Chinese hegemony. Who can tell what government would develop in the south? If a free election were held, that alone would represent the greatest expression of freedom in all its history. It is possible that a leftist but non-Communist regime would emerge, as there are a great many non-Communists in South Vietnam not only on the government side but in the Vietcong as well. The very worst that could happen, in Western eyes, would be the south falling fully under the sovereignty of Hanoi. This seems unlikely in view of southern nationalism, but even if it did occur, the probability is that Hanoi's efforts to remain independent of China would be strengthened.

The alternative to negotiation remains open-ended escalation. So the pressures must be kept against all sides—Communist, anti-Communist, and neutral—to press on for a solution.

What's Bad for TV Is Worse for Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 26, 1965

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, the then able Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Newton Minow, called television a vast wasteland. The charge touched a raw nerve in the broadcasting industry and found genuine acceptance with the public. There were assurances of review, reconsideration, and reform. Perhaps there has been reconsideration and review. There has been little reform.

One of the most perceptive students of the broadcasting scene is Mr. Fairfax M. Cone, chairman of the executive committee of Foote, Cone & Belding. He has made a very important contribution to the discussion of the problem in the article he has written which appears in *Fortune* magazine for July 1965, which I urge my colleagues to read. It follows:

WHAT'S BAD FOR TV IS WORSE FOR ADVERTISING

(By Fairfax M. Cone)

Television has grown big and rich and flabby.

Some of my best friends are in the broadcasting business and while I wish them well, I am also distressed at what I perceive to be television's uneven success. Never have profits been better for the operators and never has the product of television, which is programming, shown less imagination or less promise. During television's 20 years, entertainment, which is the principal element in programming, has rarely been explored beneath the surface of old vaudeville routines and motion picture forms. And only the prospect of repeating all of last year's monotonous attempts at amusement could be more dismal than the prospects for entertainment in the upcoming season.

Gone entirely is the old excitement about great new things to come. (They rarely materialized. But that isn't the point.) The satisfaction of the majority of broadcasters with things as they are is clear. None of the networks has scheduled a single experimental program for this summer. To be sure, CBS has begun the trial run of a twice a week nighttime feature based upon an old daytime soap opera called "As the World Turns." But this hardly an innovation. ABC pointed the way with "Peyton Place," a serial drama that has knocked out its competition twice each week. "Peyton Place," by the way, is to be shown henceforth in three weekly segments instead of two. Otherwise there will be no tests. My friends in broadcasting have again cast their lot with mediocrity.

It is no wonder, I think, that serious critics call this a dark outlook. And while I would like to be concerned with it as they are, wistfully, on purely artistic and intellectual terms, there is another side to the matter that I cannot overlook.

This is the conviction on the part of almost all viewers that there is nothing wrong with television that can't be blamed on advertising. As a result, criticism of advertising grows louder and it is more persistent than any other complaint about current business practice. Television is seen as the helpless victim of advertisers' cupidity. It is the advertisers, most people believe, who initiate all program changes; and who but the advertisers, they ask, are the perpetrators of those ghastly commercials?

To suggest that such questions may be a soothing accompaniment to the march of the broadcasters to the vaults is simply to point out the obvious. Advertising is a ready scapegoat. But advertisers must accept half the blame and most of the consequences. Advertising and television are tightly interwoven.

SEVEN OUT OF TEN OBJECT

When Newton Minow, as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, called television "a vast wasteland" several years ago, this caused some brief consternation in both industries, in advertising and broadcasting. But Minow went back to his private law practice and the hubbub subsided.

Since then questions of any kind about the makeup and the level of entertainment schedules have simply been ignored. Only a few independent station owners and operators appear to be concerned. For the rest, questions about programming are invariably shut off by referring to the audience measurements. The public, it is said, is the sole arbiter of what it shall see and hear: the program schedules are determined by tune-in and tune-out as calculated in the Nielsen Television Index. This, I must admit, is true. The trouble is that audience ratings are based entirely on the programs that are available. They suggest little or nothing

about the interests or wishes of nonviewers of the material surveyed.

Acceptance of television advertising by the general public is measured by a similarly defective standard. When people are asked whether the showing of commercials is a fair price to pay for the privilege of watching television, they reply in the affirmative in the ratio of 4 to 1. However, this scarcely means approval of television advertising in toto.

Elmo Roper & Associates recently completed a study for the Television Information Office in which a large sample of the public was asked: "Which one of these four statements comes closest to describing how you feel about commercials on television?" Each person was then shown a card that listed the four choices corresponding to the attitude range. These are the results from the total sample:

	Percent
I dislike practically all commercials on television.....	10
While some of the commercials on television are all right, most of them are very annoying.....	26
There are some very annoying commercials on television, but most of them are perfectly all right.....	35
The commercials on television seldom annoy me—in fact, I often enjoy them.....	23
Don't know or no answer.....	6

While this study can be read to say that favorable attitudes toward TV advertising outstripped unfavorable attitudes by 3 to 2 (and this is exactly what the Television Information Office does say), the answers may also be interpreted to mean that 7 out of 10 people find at least some commercials objectionable. The reasons given for these objections are "too noisy and loud," "many are done in poor taste," and "there are far too many commercials." The study indicates also that while it is agreed that commercials "frequently provide useful information about new products," they often advertise things that should not be advertised. Altogether, then, it would seem that a considerable part of the U.S. viewing public finds fault with TV advertising on several grounds. This is too bad.

There are unmistakable indications that among college and university students rejection of all advertising is growing; and, of course, there is a great deal of evidence that this is encouraged by teachers. But too few television officials and television advertisers give any evidence of being alert to the hazard involved. If they did, one of the first things they would do would be to outlaw the ubiquitous weasel. The weasel is the flaw in the advertising proposition that makes its promise fuzzy. For instance: BBB tires are the largest selling tires in the world with their exclusive nonskid tread that gets you there safely in all kinds of weather. This seems to say that BBB tires have overtaken all other similar tires in popularity and in use. But does it? It does not. It merely says that these tires are the only tires with their own particular tread; so, of course, they are the largest selling in this category. The weasel rests on a slippery claim that is technically correct, and it is a favorite device of foxy TV advertisers.

Another of the indefensible practices of advertising on television is the high level of sound that makes many commercials much louder than the programs in which they are carried. Perhaps even more unpleasant and unnecessary is the quarrelsome nature of so many commercials for headache and stomach ache remedies and deodorants and detergents wherein various competitors virtually accuse each other of lying. Denigration is something that surely should be barred from the air.

things and go forth to do what needs to be done for ourselves and for our children.

Graduates of St. Joseph's College—to these ancient words of action and hope, let me add nine more, congratulations, good luck and God bless all of you.

For Mr. Monagan
Lodge to Saigon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor has recently published a pertinent editorial relating to the President's reappointment of Henry Cabot Lodge as Ambassador to South Vietnam. I believe that this editorial should be available to a larger audience and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that its description of the problems and opportunities which are available to Ambassador Lodge will be fully appreciated:

MR. LODGE'S RETURN

We extend our warmest and most wholehearted wishes to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge in the difficult but constructive task which he is reassuming in South Vietnam. For we are encouraged by Mr. Lodge's emphasis on the need for major political and economic reforms in South Vietnam. In such reforms, coupled with strong military resistance, lies the best chance—perhaps the only chance—of success in that savage war.

It is no disrespect to a dedicated and intelligent public servant like retiring Ambassador Maxwell Taylor, to believe that the reappointment of Mr. Lodge has much to commend it. We are told that Mr. Lodge won considerable support and respect from the South Vietnamese during his earlier stay in that country. Thus he begins his new assignment under advantageous conditions.

Now, as during his earlier tour of duty, one of the urgent needs is to reconcile often bitterly conflicting views among such groups as the military, the Buddhists, and the Roman Catholics. The inability of these groups to work in harmony has been a major cause of continuing governmental instability. Mr. Lodge was apparently able to work well with such differing viewpoints.

Most important of all, however, is the need—stressed by the new Ambassador—to give the average South Vietnamese the feeling that he was a real stake in the defeat of communism. Even after years of fighting and disappointment, the opportunity to do this still remains although it is glaringly apparent that only new inspiration, new ideas, and far stronger efforts can succeed in bringing this about.

So far as the fighting is concerned, this is a difficult moment for Mr. Lodge to return to South Vietnam. With the monsoon rain and clouds, there has come an upswing in Vietcong effort and success. To counter this, the United States is not only beginning to take an active shooting role on the ground but feels obliged to send more and more reinforcements.

With this turn of events has come further questioning of Washington's conduct of the war. Mr. Lodge, as a topmost Republican, will help reinforce that air of nonpartisanship on the war which President Johnson rightly seeks.

It is also interesting that Mr. Lodge's reappointment coincided with the first, faint evidence of willingness on North Vietnam's

part to receive a Western emissary—in this case Prime Minister Wilson's friend, Harold Davies. While there is no reason as yet to see any connection between these events, each contributes to a feeling of somewhat greater maneuverability in Vietnam. This maneuverability must be encouraged if we are ever to see a negotiated end to the crisis.

Salvatore Esposito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 20, Staten Island, New York City and the United States lost a great philanthropist, businessman, and patriot. Mr. Esposito was a tireless and productive member of our business, civic and religious community for all of his adult life. To his family and to his many close and personal friends, I offer my deepest sympathy and wish to include this obituary from the Staten Island Advance of Wednesday, July 21:

SALVATORE ESPOSITO, STRIKEN ON WAY TO CEREMONY FOR B.P.

Salvatore Esposito, Sr., Staten Island businessman, and leader in Italian-American affairs, suffered a heart attack in Borough President Maniscalco's limousine yesterday in Manhattan and died a short time later in New York University Hospital.

Mr. Esposito, 71, was on his way to the Italian consulate with the borough president; his son, Mario J. Esposito, and Councilman Robert G. Lindsay for the presentation to Maniscalco of Italy's Knights Officer in the Order of Merit.

Mr. Esposito was brought to Manhattan in 1906 from his native Italy and came to Staten Island more than 40 years ago. He lived at 111 Harvard Avenue, New Brighton. He was founder and president of the Canal Lumber Co. in Manhattan with a branch on Bay Street, Stapleton, and founder of the Cardinal Lumber Co., Stapleton.

During the past year, Mr. Esposito had retired from many of his activities. In June, he finished a 1-year term as national president of the American Parkinson Disease Association. He was the founder of the Staten Island chapter of the association, which was named for his wife, Elena, who died in 1961.

Last Thursday he presented a check from the association for \$2,500 to Staten Island Hospital for the establishment of an outpatient clinic. He was to be honored next month by the association and his friends.

He was a former member of the board of directors, past vice president and treasurer and a founder of the Italian Club of Staten Island.

He was also a founder of the Greater New York Suburban Lumbermen's Association, of which he was vice president, and of the Italian Historical Society of Staten Island, of which he was a former director. He was a member of the Borough President's Advisory Council.

He retired last year as a trustee of Assumption Roman Catholic Church, New Brighton, and had served as building fund chairman for the parish school. He was consul-commander of the Manhattan Division, Woodmen of the World, and president and treasurer of the Italo-America Foundation of New York City.

Mr. Esposito was also a member of the board of directors of the Italian Hospital in Manhattan and had been a member of Staten Island Chapter, American Committee for Italian Immigration.

He is survived by five sons, Joseph, of Naughton Avenue, Dongan Hills; Albert, of Greenport Street, Dongan Hills; Mario J. and George, of the home address, and Salvatore Jr., of Cascade Street, New Dorp; two daughters, Miss Nancy Esposito of the home address, and Mrs. Sophie Maestroni, of Roderick Avenue, Grasmere; a brother, Aniello, of Italy, and 17 grandchildren.

The funeral will be Saturday from the Island Funeral Home, Dongan Hills, with a requiem mass at 10 a.m. in the Assumption Church. Burial will be in St. Peter's Cemetery.

Adlai Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, among the many tributes paid to the late Adlai Stevenson none, it seems to me, are more meaningful than those emanating from persons who frequently disagreed with him politically. Among such statements is that of my friend William H. Rentschler of Illinois, Republican candidate for nomination to the U.S. Senate in 1960. Mr. Rentschler's eloquence and sincerity are embodied in the following article:

Honors mount for Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, fallen American statesman.

They come from all over the world, from the old countries in Europe and Asia, and from new lands hacked out of the African bush. They come from small towns and teeming cities in every corner of his native America. They come from the great and the ordinary, from people of every color and faith and political persuasion.

Some would deride as insincere the often effusive tributes from Adlai Stevenson's political foes, but they miss a fundamental point: that it is possible to honor and respect an adversary even as you strive mightily to defeat him. You admire his good fight, the talents he possesses that you may lack, his courage in the face of withering attack.

The widespread homage paid Adlai Stevenson reminds us of other significant facts of life in these United States: that most Americans pursue in their own strange ways the same objectives—peace, justice, equality, happiness, material well-being. And that most deep cleavages stem from conflicting notions of how to achieve those common ends.

I frequently found myself in disagreement with Adlai Stevenson on the means to reach goals we shared. I disagreed with what I felt was his tendency, lately somewhat tempered, toward accommodation in foreign affairs, and with his undue reliance on Federal solutions to most of our domestic ills.

But I respected him as a man who gave unstintingly of himself to public service; as one whose rare eloquence stirred his countrymen to high purpose; as a man of warmth and wit and compassion.

Who can forget his wry opening remark in a speech shortly after he had been buried by General Eisenhower beneath an avalanche of votes? "A funny thing happened to me on my way to the White House." A winning, even endearing comment by a man with heavy heart but a rare sense of irony and perspective.

July 27, 1965

We need in our land more men whose support of their convictions is staunch, fervent, even passionate. Stevenson was one of these. With a public eloquence surpassed in our time only by Churchill, Adlai Stevenson made his case with graceful, memorable phrase. The words were his, and he churned them out painstakingly, groping for the right adjective, changing, editing, fretting, for no speechwriter fully met his exacting standards. He presented his own, and often in the U.N., America's point of view with notable skill and distinction.

There is all too often a tendency for those who disagree with a particular line of reasoning to seek to demolish the man rather than the validity of his argument. This course usually cloaks the weakness of their case. If these dissidents were to be scrupulously fair, they would not attack or demean or seek to derogate their foes, but rather would articulate more forcefully, more effectively, more compelling their side of the controversy.

A thoughtful dialog between antagonists—who are quite likely to be seeking similar ends—pierces the murk, enlightens the audience, solidifies the objectives, clarifies the purpose, and strengthens the resolve. This is good. It is even necessary, where freedom of speech prevails. Our Nation is the beneficiary when there is searching give-and-take on the great issues of the day. Those who seek to stifle debate or force adherence to some "official" position do their country no service.

Surely it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. Adlai Stevenson sought always to throw shafts of light into dark corners. This was his great gift. He contributed notably to understanding on this shrunken planet of ours, and to enlightenment—of the American people, of all the peoples of the world.

This is Adlai Stevenson's shining legacy.

The Federal Government and State of Oregon: Partners in Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House the regrettable and ignorant alliance of the Federal Government and the State of Oregon in keeping gambling illegal in that State. I say this because by keeping gambling illegal in Oregon, the two governments are keeping gambling ripe for plucking by the mob, so that gambling profits finance every variety of mob criminal activity.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Oregon came to \$12.5 million. More meaningful, and also more dangerous is Oregon's undercover, illegal gambling. Testimony before the McClellan committee put off-track betting at \$50 billion a year nationally, and other testimony indicated that this type of gambling accounted for only 42 percent of the illegal gambling total, which would then be about \$120 billion a year. On a population basis, Oregon's share of this would come to \$1.2 billion a year. Even if this is somewhat high, there is no doubt that illegal gambling is kicking in millions of dollars every year to the mob in Oregon.

To me, it is hypocrisy to keep gambling illegal so that it serves the mob's needs for operating revenues. Why should we allow illegal gambling to finance the underworld when Government-run gambling can make gambling revenues work for the people. Unfortunately, Oregon has proven itself long on hypocrisy. When rural Oregon bluenoses some years ago objected to Oregon's dograces, these objections somehow vanished when the county fairs got cut in on the take. I would like to see an end to this hypocrisy. I would like to see the Government take over gambling and make it work for the people. I recommend a national lottery.

Millers, Bakers Cover Up Real Reason for Higher Bread Cost, Reports Tulsa Daily World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it will not be too long before this House has before it H.R. 9981, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

Title V of this bill authorizes continuation of the voluntary wheat certificate program for 4 years with modifications from current provisions aimed at boosting wheat farmers' income by about \$150 million a year, reducing Government costs, and providing more freedom in the marketing system.

The significant change from current operations would provide for price support for wheat with domestic certificates at or near 100 percent of parity and eliminate the need for export certificates to supplement wheat farmers' income. The support price for wheat for domestic food use would be increased about 50 cents per bushel to around \$2.50.

Mr. Speaker, an intensive lobbying campaign has been initiated from certain quarters against this title of the bill. I do not question the right of any group or interests to lobby against a bill before the U.S. Congress. However, I would like for all Members to have the opportunity to read an article which appeared recently in the Tulsa Daily World, of Tulsa, Okla., concerning the nature of this lobbying campaign.

Under leave to extend, the newspaper article follows:

(From the Tulsa Daily World, July 19, 1965)
FARMERS END UP WITH GOAT HORNS—MILLERS, BAKERS COVER UP REAL REASON FOR HIGHER BREAD COSTS

(By Herb Karner)

Mrs. housewife, you are being played for a sucker.

You are being told if proposed farm legislation passes it would constitute a 2-cent tax per pound loaf of bread which sells for an average price of 21 cents.

Making the "bread tax" charge is a group called the Wheat Users Committee. It is composed of 23 baking companies, one major miller, and two bakery unions.

They are basing their charge on the assumption that the current wheat certificate of 75 cents a bushel paid to farmers on domesticated wheat will be raised to \$1.25 a bushel.

They are saying this additional 50 cents a bushel will raise the cost of bread 2 cents a loaf.

The Wheat Users Committee is distorting the truth. Lest fence talk be misunderstood, we make it crystal clear we are not enamored of the wheat certificate plan. It is a bothersome, cumbersome, inefficient way of doing business. We believe there is a better way of raising farm income, which we will not go into now.

We readily agree with the milling trade that administration of the certificate plan is a nuisance.

But, we resent mightily distortion of fact by the committee in an effort to defeat the proposed wheat legislation.

What are the facts? Currently farmers get 75 cents a bushel for wheat used in domestic consumption, bringing the cost of wheat to millers to around \$2 a bushel. Reason for the certificate plan is to bring wheat farmer income to a reasonable level compared with the rest of the economy.

Now, it is proposed the level is not high enough—that a 50-cent-a-bushel increase in certificate value would bring domestic wheat to near 100 percent of parity.

Fact is the farm value of wheat going into a loaf of bread is 2.5 cents—based on \$2 a bushel wheat. It is significant that this is a decrease from 2.7 cents back in 1947. In 1947-49 the farmer's share of the retail price of a loaf of bread was 24 percent. This has declined to 14 percent.

Truth is if wheat is raised from \$2 to \$2.50 a bushel it would raise the cost of wheat in a loaf of bread one-half cent—not 2 cents as the committee claims.

A farmer could donate the wheat in a loaf of bread and it would not lower the price of bread appreciably. By the same token, if the price of wheat to a farmer was doubled, it wouldn't affect prices greatly.

Why does the committee distort facts? Because they've got something to hide—and what they are trying to hide from consumers is that the widening price spread between 1947-49 and now is due primarily to higher costs for baking and distributing bread.

Hourly earnings of production workers in bakeries in 1963 were \$1.18 an hour higher than in 1947-49, increasing from \$1.15 to \$2.33 an hour. This 103-percent increase was passed along to consumers.

Again, make no mistake—we are not against increased wages to workers. We believe they should have adequate wages.

We do object to all sorts of red herrings dragged across the trail to make it appear that increased bread prices are the fault of farmers.

Here's a breakdown of what has happened to a 1-pound loaf of bread now retailing for 21 cents:

[Figures in cents]

	1947	1963
Wages, salaries, fringe benefits, social security, and officers' compensation.....	2.2	6.2
Packaging and wrapping.....	.5	1.4
Delivery, other than wages.....	.4	1.1
Advertising, promotion, etc.....	.2	.9
Profits after taxes (baker-wholesale).....	.2	.2
Retail margin.....	2.7	3.6
Wheat cost (to farmers).....	2.7	2.5
Other ingredient costs.....	.2	.2
Total.....	10.0	21.0

That's the story of the increased cost of bread. While farmers have been getting less, others have been getting more—and the increase, more than 11 cents a loaf during the period—is passed on to consumers.